

OBS

1797
Mr. CHUBB'S DISCOURSE

CONCERNING

R E A S O N :

Wherein his ATTEMPT to prove,

That REASON either Is, or Ought to be, a
Sufficient GUIDE in Matters of Religion,

IS CONSIDER'D;

AND

His ARGUMENTS are shewn to be Frivolous
and Inconclusive.

By ANTHONY BLISS, A. M.
Vicar of PORTSMOUTH.

*Nay, but, O Man, who art thou that repliest against
God?*
Rom. ix. 20.

L O N D O N :

Printed for Samuel Wilmot, Bookseller, in Oxford: And sold
by J. and J. Knapton, R. Knaplock, W. Innys, T. Astley,
J. Crownfield, in St. Paul's Church-yard; J. Batley, in
Pater-noster Row; S. Birt in Ave-Mary Lane; B. Motte
and W. Bickerton, near Temple-Bar, London.

[Price One Shilling.]

✓





OBSERVATIONS

ON

Mr. CHUBB'S DISCOURSE
concerning *REASON*, &c.

S I R,



IN the late Conversation we had about the *Sufficiency of Reason in Matters of Religion*, I thought I had said enough to overthrow all your Pretences for it; but it seems “ Mr. “ *Chubb's DISCOURSE CONCERNING REASON, &c.* has re-establish'd” you in your Hypothesis, and you are “ satisfy'd “ he has fully prov'd, that Reason alone *is* or “ *ought* to be sufficient to discover the Fitness of “ every good moral Action the Gospel enjoins, “ and the Unfitness of every immoral one it prohibits, together with the *Certainty* of the *Motives* “ to Religion, the *Immortality* of the Soul, and “ a *perpetual* State of Rewards and Punishments “ in the next World.” In particular you seem hugely pleas'd with p. 21, 22. where “ *Repentance* and *Reformation* are represented as proper “ Grounds of Forgiveness:” And tho' you cannot
B “ fully

“ fully assent to what he argues about the *Satisfaction* of Christ, yet you apprehend 'twill be “ no easy matter to overthrow it.” The high Character you gave of this Performance, made me desirous of looking into it, and I am not a little concern'd, to see how precipitately you judge, and how miserably mistake a *Shadow* for a *Substance*. Upon Examination I find, that in many Places there is nothing else but quibbling upon Words; in most, the Arguments are weak and inconclusive; and *some* Things, which you say are *fully* prov'd, the Author don't so much as attempt to prove *absolutely*, but only *hypothetically*; and upon *such* an Hypothesis too, or Supposition, as I see no Reason, why you should esteem true in *Fact*. All this appears plain to me; and my Design in the following Strictures is, to induce you, (if I may be so happy) to be of the same Opinion.

Mr. Chubb would seem to proceed with great Caution, making the Point in Debate to be, not whether Reason be *absolutely* a sufficient Guide in Matters of Religion, but that it either *is* or *ought* to be so; p. 4, 6, 29. And yet, as he must be fully in the Opinion, that 'tis a sufficient Guide, it were to be wish'd he had made *That simply* the Point to be disputed; (which he might have endeavour'd to prove, by bringing what Arguments he could, to shew that it *ought* to be so;) because this, I apprehend, favours more of that Reverence for God, which we should be careful to preserve in all our Discourses about him. In p. 23. he argues, “ *Supposing what my Lord Bishop of London has* “ *urg'd, — proves his Point, viz. that Reason is not* “ *a sufficient Guide in Matters of Religion; yet then,* “ *I say, that it does not take off the Force of my Argu-* “ *ment, — because in Justice and Equity it ought to* “ *have been so:*” And yet 'tis plain that under the Supposition he makes, he can have no Ground to build

build an Argument upon, but what leads directly to Atheism; which surely no good or wise Man will run into in Defence of his Reason, or rather than give up the Sufficiency of it in the Business of Religion. If the Matter of *Fact* be certain, that Reason is *not* a sufficient Guide, there is no room to alledge, that in Justice and Equity it *ought* to be so; because we cannot have better, or even so good Reasons for *that* Allegation, as we have for the Being of a GOD; (which, under this Supposition, is directly impugn'd thereby :) or see so many and great Absurdities in the opposite Opinion, as are easily discernible in the *Atheistical* Scheme.

But to let this pass. If Reason be or ought to be a sufficient Guide in Religion, it must be so in respect to,

First, The *Matter* of Man's Duty: *i. e.* it must be capable of discovering what Actions, as having a *natural Fitness* or *Unfitness* in them, it is the Will of GOD we should do or forbear doing.

Secondly, The *Motives* to Obedience.

And, Thirdly, The Way and Manner *how* GOD may be pleas'd after he has been offended by Trespases and Sin.

Thus far is plain: And you will readily grant, that, however good a Guide Reason is in *any two* of these Respects, yet, if it is, and may be defective in the *third*, you must be oblig'd then to give up your Point. But beside this, it may be of use to make the three following Observations.

First, That you must be understood in this Argument to speak *universally*, as well concerning the *meanest* of the People, Cottagers and Day-Labourers of a low Genius and poor natural Parts, as those of the most extraordinary Talents and Capacities. I don't see upon what Grounds it can be affirm'd that *any one* by the Dint of Reason *alone* can draw out a compleat System of Religion; give an exact

Plan of *all* our Duties ; and prove the Immortality of the Soul, &c. by just and *necessary* Illations. But supposing such an one as *Plato* could do this ; As there is undoubtedly a Difference in the Size of Mens Souls, and all are not born with a Genius equal to *Plato's*, what would this signify to the Bulk of Mankind, who neither are oblig'd to resign themselves up *implicitly* to any human Authority, nor seem capable of being taught *much* of Religion, by *abstract* Reasonings from the Nature and Relations of Things ? It is well observ'd by Mr. *Lock*, that * “ The greatest Part of Man-
 “ kind want Leisure or Capacity for Demonstra-
 “ tion ; nor can carry a Train of Proofs, which
 “ in *that* Way they must always depend upon for
 “ Conviction, and cannot be requir'd to assent to
 “ till they see the Demonstration. Where-ever
 “ they stick, the Teachers are always put upon
 “ Proof, and must clear the Doubt by a Thread
 “ of coherent Deductions from the first Principle,
 “ how long or how intricate soever that be. And
 “ you may as soon hope to have all the Day-
 “ Labourers and Tradesmen, the Spinsters and
 “ Dairy-maids perfect Mathematicians, as to have
 “ them perfect in *Etbicks* this Way.”

But beside this, I may observe farther, that if the Principle you maintain be true, it must *necessa- rily* be so : *i. e.* it is a thing *impossible* and a *Contra- diction* that it should be otherwise ; and therefore the Truth of it must not be left to rest upon such a *Contingency*, as the rising up of so *extraordinary* a Genius, as few Nations or Ages ever produc'd. In short, you must maintain that *no one* Person is or *ought* to be sent into the World with a Head so meanly furnish'd, as not to be able, without any Assistance in the least from other People, to find

* Vol. II. p. 535.

out all the Duties and Motives of Religion. This, I take, to be a natural Consequence from your Principle: And therefore a late Advocate for *Reason* maintains that Men of the meanest Abilities * may find out every Part of true Religion without a Revelation from GOD, or any Instructions from other Men, and that Reason is as certain a Guide for rational Creatures, as Instinct is for irrational.

Secondly, You must not estimate the Sufficiency of Reason in this Argument, by what it has a bare *physical* Power of doing. Suppose a Man to be under ten thousand times more Temptations than any one ever was; there is a bare *physical* Possibility arising from his Nature, as a free Agent, of his living all his Life-time, (be it ever so long) without committing so much as one *wilful* Sin; But who would deem him capable in a *moral* Account, or sufficiently qualify'd to live so upon that slender Bottom? In like manner, as to the Knowledge of our Duty, and of the Motives to it; Suppose there is no *absolute* Impossibility of its being attain'd by the Dint of Reason; is this Ground enough for saying Reason is a sufficient Guide as to these Matters? No certainly, as the World would generally understand the Term *sufficient*, in this Instance; but 'tis necessary to consider farther, whether *every Individual* (if left to the Guidance of Nature only) may attain this Knowledge with reasonable *Ease* and *Facility*, so as to be a proper Object of *eternal* Punishment, if he does not make those Discoveries in order to a correspondent Practice, as well as of Rewards, in case he does. — Then as to the other Point, that Reason *ought* to be sufficient, this can be pleaded only *hypothetically*, on a *Supposition* (never prov'd to be true in any one pertinent Instance) of People's having *no other*

* Christianity as old, &c. p. 234, 276, — 281, 295.

Light than that of Nature, and no Opportunity of becoming acquainted with Revelation. For GOD may bestow his Gifts in what Manner he pleases, and let Reason be as defective as it will, this is no *absolute* Ground of Complaint; because that Defect *may* be supply'd by Revelation; and where-ever it is, or *might* have been so, (if the Aids of Revelation had been duly sought after:) there is no room to say, that Reason ought to have been stronger and more extensive.

Lastly, I understand your Meaning to be, that Man by the Light of Nature may not only avoid Misery, and make sure of a happy State in the next World, but also that he is or ought to be able; by the Duct of that Light *only*, to intitle himself to the *same* Degree of Happiness hereafter, as *any* under the Gospel are intitled to. This is a natural Consequence from your Principles; and unless you will maintain this, you only argue *a dicto secundum quid, ad dictum simpliciter*, which is bad Logick. For let Reason be what it will in *one* View and *one* particular Respect, this is not Ground enough for asserting in *general*, that it is or ought to be a sufficient Guide in Religion: The natural Import of which is, that it is, or ought to be so in *every* View and *every* Respect. And if this be what you mean, you may bethink yourself of some Proof of it. Certain it is, Mr. C. has prov'd nothing like it.

These Observations being premis'd, I will go over the Particulars before laid down, beginning with the Matter of our Duty. For the clearer Discussion of which, I will

First, Set forth why I believe Reason is *not* sufficient as to the *Matter* thereof, or not capable of discovering what Actions, as having a *natural Fitness* or *Unfitness* in them, it is the Will of GOD we should do, or forbear doing. After which I will examine,

Secondly,

Secondly, Whether Mr. C. has prov'd that Reason is a sufficient Guide in this respect. Or,

Lastly, Whether he has prov'd it *ought* to be so.

To begin with the first Head. That there is a moral Law of fix'd and standing Obligation, regulating our Conduct with respect to GOD, our Neighbour, and Ourselves, and requiring us to do some Actions, and to forbear others, is past doubt; And we, who have the Advantage of *Revelation*, know how to reduce these Actions to their proper Class. For Instance, we know that to forgive the most provoking Injuries, to love our Enemies, to worship GOD in Spirit and in Truth, &c. are good Actions, and Duties to be perform'd. On the other hand we know, that Self-murder, inward Concupiscence, Idolatry, worshipping GOD thro' a Mediator not of his Appointment, &c. are evil Actions, and to be avoided by us. But the Query is, whether *Reason* could have made the same Discoveries? To enable myself to judge of which, I have consider'd what I could collect myself, or have found collected by others, concerning the Morality of the Heathens; And since the most civiliz'd Heathen Nations we ever heard of, were sunk deep into the vilest Principles; since the greatest of their Philosophers never set forth any thing like a *complete* System of *Ethicks*, deduc'd from plain Principles of Reason, and comprehending all the Branches of our Duty; but instead of that fell into numberless gross Errors, calling Good Evil, and Evil Good; upon *these* Accounts, I know not how to believe, that *any* Man by the *unassisted* Strength of his own Mind, can draw out a *Pandect* of the Law of Nature. fit to be a *Standard* to all Mankind, and to which they ought to conform their Manners: Much less can I believe that *every Individual*, of however *mean* a Capacity,

can possibly do this; and much less still, that he can do it with reasonable *Ease* and *Facility*, so as to be a *meet* Object of eternal Punishment in case he should fail therein: Lastly, if all this were made plain, it would still remain a Doubt, whether a mere * Pagan, not having the same sound and elevated Notions of God, his Essence, Works, and Ways; nor the same Grounds or Motives for believing in, loving, and obeying God; nor being in the same Covenant-Relation with God, as a Christian, can secure an equal Measure of Blessedness in the Life to come.

Not to mention what others have done, the *Bishop of London* has shewn, that tho' † “ the
 “ Light of Nature might in general suggest to
 “ Men the Reasonableness of joining in Worship,
 “ yet in what Manner God would be worshipp'd,
 “ and in what Way they might perform a Service
 “ that would be acceptable to him, was understood by the antient Heathens, to be a Point,
 “ which the Wit and Penetration of Man could
 “ not fix and determine;” that § “ while some
 “ affirm'd that Virtue and Vice, as founded in
 “ the Nature of Things, were eternal and unchangeable, it was the Doctrine of others, that
 “ nothing was good or evil, just or unjust, right
 “ or wrong, otherwise than as the Laws and Customs of particular Countries determin'd.” He has shewn, || “ *Plato* taught the Expedience and
 “ Lawfulness of exposing Children in particular
 “ Cases, and *Aristotle* also of Abortion. At
 “ *Athens*, the great Seat and Nursery of Philosophers, it was laid down for a Rule, that Infants,

* *Clarke's* Expos. of the Ch. Catechism, p. 9. *Foster's* Usefulness, Truth, and Excellency of the Christian Religion, p. 32, 33. Edit. 2.

† Second Pastoral Letter, p. 15.

§ *Ibid.* p. 20. || P. 27.

“ which appear’d to be maim’d, should either be
 “ kill’d or expos’d. — Many of the Philosophers
 “ maintain’d the Lawfulness of Self-murder. Not
 “ only the *Epicureans* and others, but even *Plato*
 “ himself allow’d Fornication, and, which is more
 “ shocking, a Community of Wives. The most
 “ famous among them were known not only to
 “ approve but practise unnatural Lust. To which
 “ we may add the *Cynicks*, who laying aside the
 “ natural Restraints of Shame and Modesty, com-
 “ mitted the Acts of Lust, like brute Beasts, openly
 “ and in the sight of the Sun: And the *Stoicks*,
 “ who held that no Words or Speech of any kind
 “ ought to be avoided or censur’d as filthy and
 “ obscene.” Farther it is observ’d, that * “ in
 “ private Life *we cannot* reasonably hope or expect
 “ to find among them the great Virtues of Love,
 “ Meekness, and Forgiveness, when we find *So-*
 “ *crates* declaring it neither unjust nor revengeful
 “ to rejoice in the Calamities of our Enemies; and
 “ *Cicero* expressly approving and professing Re-
 “ venge; and *Aristotle* speaking of Meekness not
 “ only as a Defect of the Mind, and as carrying in
 “ it too great a Disposition to forgive, but calling
 “ the patient enduring of Reproach the Spirit of a
 “ Slave.”

This and a great deal more is excellently argued
 by this learned *Prelate*. Let us now hear Mr. C.
 “ *It is true that Creatures endow’d with Reason,*
 “ *when they neglect or abuse that noble Faculty, are*
 “ *liable to run into the most vile and abominable Opi-*
 “ *nions and Practices; and this is abundantly evident*
 “ *from my Lord Bishop of London’s Account of this*
 “ *Matter: But, that Reason, when duly and faith-*
 “ *fully exercis’d, is not a sufficient Guide in Matters*
 “ *of Religion, does by no means follow from any thing*

* P. 29.

“ which

“ *which his Lordship has advanc'd on this Head.*”
 p. 23. This you “ apprehend is a satisfactory
 “ Reply to all that his Lordship has said concern-
 “ ing the vile Principles and Practices of the Hea-
 “ thens.” Be it so: His *Lordship* has argued from
 several *other* Topics, and maintains the Insuffi-
 ciency of Reason upon the * *joint* Evidence arising
 from the Whole. Mr. C. has been far from dis-
 tinctly replying to his Lordship's Observations;
 and yet if Reason be insufficient in *any one* Instance
 assign'd by his Lordship, he must either give up
 his Point, or turn *Atheist*. But let us consider the
 Force of his Answer to this *single* Head. His
 Meaning is, that it does not follow *absolutely*, in
 the Way of *strict* Proof and Demonstration, from
 any thing his Lordship has said upon it, that Rea-
 son is not a sufficient Guide; in which he discovers
 great Heedlessness; because it was not his Lord-
 ship's Business or Design, in remarking how vile
 the Principles and Practices of the Heathens in all
 Ages have been, to give an absolute Proof of the
Negative, — that Reason is not capable of disco-
 vering the Whole of human Duty; (a Thing, im-
 possible to be done, tho' the Matter of Fact were
 ever so true:) but to produce, all things consi-
 der'd, a reasonable Degree of *moral* Evidence in
 Favour of it. If it were certain that *no* Heathen
 ever drew out a just System of Ethicks, but that
all of them were ignorant of some great and impor-
 tant Points of Duty, and had very vile Notions in
 others, I suppose Mr. C. would still stand out,
 imputing all this, not to any Insufficiency in Rea-
 son to have instructed them better, but to their
 own Default in not using it aright; and 'tis very
 plain he might do it upon the same Bottom he
 now does. But how then are we to judge of the

* Second Pastoral Letter, p. 13, 14.

Strength of Man's Understanding? By what Method of Investigation shall we come to determine, whether Reason is or is not a sufficient Guide in these Matters? I know of no better and indeed no other than this, to observe as well as we can, by conversing with Heathens, or reading their Books, or examining what others have wrote faithfully about them, how far unassisted Reason *has* actually went, or whether any one by the Exercise thereof *did* ever draw out a compleat System of those Duties which Man owes to GOD, his Neighbour, and Himself? 'Tis easy to sit down and say a great many fine things about the Dignity of Man's Nature, and the Excellence of his Understanding; but unless we build upon *History, Experience, and Observation*, 'twill all be no better than a *Romance*, or the whimsical Offspring of a distemper'd Fancy. We know ourselves to be endow'd with Understanding, and 'tis essential to *Man's* Character to be so; but this alone is no Evidence that we could of ourselves, and without any manner of Assistance from Revelation, have discover'd the whole Compass of moral Duty, unless the lowest Order of Intelligences, and the lowest Individual of that Order, which GOD either has, or *can* create, must be suppos'd capable of making the same Discoveries. We must therefore have recourse to Observations, and judge of Man's natural Abilities, or what he *can* do, by what he *has* done. This is the Way, which the excellent *Prelate* above-mention'd has taken; and if the Instances he has produc'd of the vile Principles and Practices of the most civiliz'd and learned among the old Heathens, don't *absolutely* prove the Insufficiency of Reason, yet they make it *exceeding probable*, and afford as much Evidence in the Case, as can *reasonably* be requir'd, or the Case will *bear*. It could not be expected of his Lordship, that he would, in the
strict

strict and *absolute* Sense, prove the *Negative*: viz. that *no* Man by the Dint of Reason can draw out an exact Plan of the moral Law. 'Tis enough, that he has made it *morally* certain; or (which is all that could be requir'd of his Lordship) that he has at least, given a strong presumptive Proof that *every Individual*, of however *mean* a Capacity, is not equal to this great Work; and 'tis strangely absurd to maintain that *all* Mankind are very well qualify'd for doing *that*, which never yet was prov'd to have been done by *any one*, and which the most eminent Heathens are *known* to have fail'd in. Mr. C. had his Lordship's Observations before him, but slips over them in a most unaccountable manner. It might have been expected, that he would have instanc'd in some body or other, who, by a due and faithful Exercise of his Reason, not only arriv'd nearer to Perfection in moral Science, but also drew out a *full* and *faultless* Draught of it, fit to be copy'd by the whole Species. This would have had some Weight in the Controversy, but nothing short of this will be of any Service.

Suppose it to be a Matter in Debate, whether the *Satellites* of *Saturn* can be discover'd by the naked Eye. *Galilæo* might, for the Honour of his own Invention, produce the Testimonies of ten thousand People, who, notwithstanding they made repeated Trials, never discover'd them without the Help of a *Telescope*. An Adversary might alledge, that these Instances, and ten million times as many more, cannot prove or demonstrate the Point. They might not make their Observations at proper Seasons; their visive Faculty might be originally weak, or some way or other since impair'd. All this is very true, and thus far he would proceed plausibly enough; but to stop here, would be to spoil all, and make himself ridiculous. He must

go on, and produce Instances to confront those on the other Side; Instances of People, who have seen these *Phænomena* with the naked Eye; otherwise, notwithstanding *Galilæo's* Argument proceeds *negatively*, all sober Judges will readily believe the Truth lies on his Side. In like manner here; 'tis not enough to say his Lordship's Reasoning does not *absolutely* conclude, or carry *Demonstration* with it. This may and does arise from the Nature of the Case, as not admitting of *such* strict Proof. Nevertheless his Lordship has said enough, all things consider'd, to silence any reasonable Adversary. There were no greater Men among the old Heathens, than *Socrates*, *Plato*, *Aristotle*, and *Tully*: and yet these, as well as the lower Sort of People, notwithstanding the Strength of their Genius's, the Inquisitiveness of their Tempers, the great Pains they were at in reading, meditating, and disputing; I may add also, notwithstanding all the Helps they had one way or another from Revelation, taught Doctrines which set Men loose from the Obligation of Duty, maintain'd Principles destructive of all Virtue, and approv'd and recommended Practices of an enormous Nature. This is strongly in Favour of the *Negative*. What has Mr. C. to reply to it? What Instances can he bring of mere Heathens more knowing than these, or that form'd to themselves a better, a more exact, and in *every* Respect a just System of Morality? He neither makes mention, nor gives the least Hint of any such; and yet till something like this be done, 'tis obvious enough, he will but trifle, and not be able to gain his Point. In short, our Author don't seem to consider what Part he takes in the Argument, and, notwithstanding he has been so frequent a *Dabbler* in Controversy, is still transgressing one great Rule of it, shuffling himself into the *Defensive*, when the *Opponency* belongs to him, and is his proper Business.

He

He maintains the *affirmative* Side of the Question; therefore he must bring forth his *strong Reasons*, and make it plain. The Proof lies upon him, and he has no Right, 'tis disingenuous and absurd to ask for a strict Proof of the *Negative*. Nevertheless the Bishop of *London* has advanc'd a great Way in Favour of it; far enough to render it unreasonable in any one to insist on the opposite Side of the Question, till *another* Sort of Heathens shall arise, I mean Men of *more* Acuteness and *deeper* Penetration in divine Matters, than the World has hitherto been acquainted with. If Mr. C. knows of any such, this will give some Colour to his Pretence; but whatever he thinks fit to urge from any other Topic, 'tis easy to prognosticate 'twill be of little Service. However I must consider,

Secondly, What he has urg'd, and whether it proves Reason to be a sufficient Guide as to the Matter of our Duty. One of his Pleas is, "If
 " Reason be a proper Judge in Matters of Revelation
 " (which I think is an allowed Case;) then surely no
 " Reason can be given, why it should not be a sufficient
 " Guide in Matters of Religion, seeing one seems to
 " be as much within the Province [Power] of Reason
 " as the other; and what is a proper [competent]
 " Qualification for the former, seems equally to be a
 " proper [competent] Qualification for the latter."
 p. 28. Here again he forgets himself, requiring Reasons from others, when 'tis his own proper Business to give them; and 'tis a shrewd Sign he finds himself at a Loss in the *Opponency*, when he is so forward to turn to the *Defensive*. If he thinks Reason is as competent a Guide in one Case, as in the other, he may prove it, when he can. In the mean time I shall go on to believe, that 'tis *one* thing to learn the Immortality of the Soul, a Judgment to come, (for to *these* Points also his Argument reaches) and other great Truths of Religion,
 from

from the Writings of inspir'd Men, vouching their Mission from Heaven by a Series of Miracles : *Another* and more difficult, to make a Discovery of these Truths by the Workings of our own Brains ; and that the *same* Degree of natural Reason, which qualifies a Man to do the *former*, will not qualify him to do the *latter*. It requires no great Reach of Thought to discover what Duties the Gospel enjoins, and what Motives it proposes ; that its Doctrines are worthy of GOD, carrying no Repugnancy to the justest Notions we have of him ; and that Christ and his Apostles had Credentials from Heaven. An illiterate Christian may easily satisfy himself in all this, as Experience shews ; but that the same important Truths, which he is fully assur'd of, by reading them in his Bible, (Truths, which the most learned in all the Schools of *Greece* and *Rome* were either quite ignorant of, or doubtful about :) he could as easily have discover'd by the Use of his own Reason, is, what I cannot conceive, and Mr. C. will never be able to prove. * “ Every
“ one may observe, *says Mr. Lock*, a great many
“ Truths, which he receives at first from others,
“ and readily assents to as consonant to Reason,
“ which he would have found it hard, and per-
“ haps beyond his Strength, to have discover'd
“ himself. Native and original Truth is not so
“ easily wrought out of the Mine, as we, who
“ have it delivered, ready dug and fashion'd into
“ our Hands, are apt to imagine. And how often
“ at fifty or threescore Years old are thinking Men
“ told, what they wonder how they could miss
“ thinking of ? Which yet their own Contem-
“ plations did not, and possibly never would have
“ help'd them to.”

* Vol. II. p. 532. See also, to the same Purpose, Dr. *Clarke's* Sermons, Vol. IX. p. 166.

Again Mr. C. argues, “ *If Reason is at all a Guide in Matters of Religion, (which, I think, will not be deny’d; then surely it may be [it is] a sufficient Guide; because one Part of our Duty is as agreeable to Reason, and (for any thing that appears to the contrary) is as easy to be discover’d by it as another.*” p. 28. A strange kind of Argument indeed! As much as to say, If Reason will teach a Man he should honour his Parents, and love his Friends, it will also teach him he should love his Enemies; a Duty, which the most eminent Heathens don’t seem ever to have dreamt of: Or thus, If Reason might teach us not to *murder* one, who has done us an Injury, it might as readily teach us, not to withhold a *Kindness* from him, which lies in our Power. I can’t see by what Logick the *Antecedent* and the *Consequent* can be brought together. The Thought is so extravagant, that he never attempts to prove it, but is glad to slide away out of his own Province, pretending that “ *nothing appears to the contrary.*” Besides, what if one Part of our *Duty* is as easy to be discover’d by Reason as another? Why must the Matters of Religion be confin’d to the *Duties* of it? Why was no notice taken of the *Motives*? Or is it Mr. C’s Opinion, that if Reason is at all a Guide in Matters of Religion, or can discover any one *single* Duty of it; then surely it may be and is a sufficient Guide, *i. e.* able to discover not only *all* the other *Duties*, but also the *Motives* to Obedience? *This* his Argument requires him to say; but he may as well hope to connect or bring together the two *Poles*, as these two *Positions*.

I have been looking whether there is any other Passage, that will come under this Head, but none occurs. Hitherto then I have proceeded securely, having met with no Opposition worth speaking of, nothing that deserves the Name of an Argument.

Mr.

Mr. C. indeed seems conscious that this Point, if left to rest upon its *own* Bottom, is utterly indefensible; and therefore he touches it but softly and with a trembling Hand, breaking off from his feeble Attempts to prove it with these Words; “*However this is not the Point I undertook to maintain; that being &c.*” p. 29. The main Article, and what he most confides in, is still behind, and will now be consider’d under the last Enquiry, *viz.*

Thirdly, Whether Mr. C. has prov’d that Reason *ought* to be a sufficient Guide as to the Matter of our Duty. Having observ’d that “*Man in his natural State, when destitute of divine Revelation, is suppos’d to be an accountable Creature, — who will be amply rewarded or severely punish’d in another World, according as he behaves in this;*” he goes on to argue, “*Now admitting this to be the Case, then, I say, that Man has a Right, by the Laws of common Equity, to be invested with such a Capacity or Power, as is sufficient (when duly exercis’d) to discover what it is he is accountable for; — because if the Case be otherwise, then he is unfairly and unequally dealt with.*” p. 4, 5. The like Argument occurs in several other Places, and ’tis, I think, the only one he produces on this Occasion. In Answer to it, I observe, *First*, That you read with very little Attention indeed, if you take this for a *full* and *absolute* Proof. It is built entirely on the *Supposition* of Men’s being destitute of *all* Advantages from Revelation, and yet design’d for ample Rewards and Punishments in the next World, according to their Behaviour here; so that there is no more Conclusiveness, no more Truth, *absolutely* speaking, in this Way of Reasoning, than there is Truth in that *Supposition*; *i. e.* (for ought ever appear’d) none at all. But this will come under Consideration in another Place.

I observe therefore, *Secondly*, That admitting the Case to be, as he supposes, yet still his Argument is far from proving what you apprehend it does. For what if *Tilenus*, by the bare Use of his own Reason, may discover all that *himself* will be accountable for? this only shews the Goodness of God, that he is no *Egyptian* Task-master, not at all the Sufficiency of *Tilenus's* Reason. God Almighty may overlook what Errors or Ignorances he pleases; but does his Goodness alter the Nature and Properties of Things? make Ignorance to be no Defect of Knowledge, and Blindness to be the same, as the clearest Eye-sight? According to Mr. C's Way of Thinking, 'twill be no Diminution to *Tilenus's* Knowledge in religious Matters, let him make ever so many Blunders and Mistakes, concerning the natural Fitness of such and such Actions, provided they are not imputed to him, and his Ignorance will be *no* Ignorance, if it be but *invincible*. He may be incapable of seeing any Unfitness in the Idolatry and Superstition of his Country, in Self-murder, exposing weak and sickly Infants, or revenging an Injury; and yet it seems, notwithstanding all this, his Reason will be a sufficient Guide in all religious Matters; because forsooth these Errors, being suppos'd to be altogether involuntary, will not be reckon'd to him; which is a Way of Reasoning that a Man of plain good Sense would never have thought of on this Occasion.

The Truth is, our Author does nothing else but quibble, and descends to the lowest piece of Sophistry, playing upon Words. He does not use his Terms uniformly in one Sense, but makes them stand sometimes for one Idea, sometimes for another, as will best serve his Turn, and the present Exigence requires. To have proceeded fairly in his Argument, according to the natural Import of it,

it, and as every Reader might have expected, he should have endeavour'd to prove that Reason *ought* to be a sufficient Guide with respect to religious Matters, in the same Latitude of the Expression, *i. e.* capable of making the same Discoveries, as he maintains it *is* sufficient; but this he never attempts to do, and the Matters of Religion in one Case are strangely different from, and may be diametrically opposite to, those in the other. When he asserts Reason *is* a sufficient Guide, he means no less, than that it can of itself draw out a *perfect* System of the moral Law. This is plain from the Arguments above-mention'd, which he endeavours to prove it by; *viz.* that Reason is as well qualify'd to be a Guide in Matters of Religion, as to be a Judge in Matters of Revelation; and that, if it be at all a Guide, it must be a sufficient one, because one Part of our Duty is as easily discoverable by it, as another. But whenever he argues that Reason *ought* to be a sufficient Guide, he constantly sinks his Note, affixes a *new* and *narrower* Set of Ideas to his Words, and, whatever he would be thought to do, proves no more, than that any Man in a State of Nature is capable of discovering whatever *himself* will be accountable for. This, I say, is the utmost he proves, and the Argument, from the Justice and Equity of God, cannot possibly be push'd a jot farther. But then, whom does Mr. C. oppose in this? Has the *Bishop of London* deny'd it? No, His Lordship says expressly, * “ If it appear'd that God
“ would judge Men for the Transgression of any
“ Duty, which they did not and could not know
“ to be their Duty, — it would be difficult to
“ reconcile such a Proceeding to the divine Justice;
“ but since the contrary to this is true, and it is

* Second Pastoral Letter, p. 45.

" certain GOD will not punish Men for invincible
 " Ignorance, surely he is at liberty" &c. Again,
 * " Tho' the Light of Reason is but dim, yet
 " they who have no better Light to walk by, and
 " who honestly make use of that, as the only
 " Guide GOD has given them, cannot fail to be
 " mercifully dealt with by infinite Justice and
 " Goodness." And yet he very consistently main-
 tains, that Reason is not a sufficient Guide in Mat-
 ters of Religion, meaning by those Matters what
 he ought to mean by them, and using the Phrase
 in the *proper, ordinary* Sense, in *that very* Sense
 which Mr. C. himself uses it in, whenever he asserts
 that Reason is sufficient in religious Matters. In
 short, our Author's Doctrine plainly stated is this,
 — That Reason either is a sufficient Guide in
 Matters of Religion, *i. e.* capable of drawing out
 a just System of Morality, fit to be a *Standard* to
 the whole Species, and as exact as *that*, which it
 finds reveal'd in the *Gospel*: or else it *ought* to be
 a sufficient Guide in the VERY SAME MAT-
 TERS, that is to say, capable of discovering *all*,
 (be it *much*, or *little*, or next to *nothing*) that *this*
 or *that* Man, who has no better Guide than his
 Reason, will be accountable for. This is the ut-
 most that can be made of it; and whether such
 quibbling upon Words is becoming any Writer,
 yourself may judge. I conclude with observing,
 that in the former of these Articles he opposes the
Pastoral Letter, but trifles egregiously when he
 attempts to prove it: In the latter he would *seem*
 to oppose it, notwithstanding the excellent Author
 has, as plainly as Words can express it, taught the
 same Thing.

I proceed now to the SECOND general Head,
viz. Whether Reason is or ought to be a sufficient

* Ibid. p. 46.

Guide as to the *Motives* of Religion. This is a Point of the utmost Consequence in the Debate. The *Motives* to Action enter into the *Disposition* of the Agent, and are of necessary Consideration towards fixing the moral Character of the Act, whether good or evil. A Thing may be *materially* good, or have a natural Utility; but, unless it be done with † *heavenly* Views, in Obedience to the Will of GOD, and because 'tis acceptable to him, 'tis nothing in moral Account, and has no more Virtue or Religion belonging to it, than there is in the Services of an Horse or Mule, that have no Understanding.

One might have expected therefore, that Mr. C. would have *first* told us plainly what the *proper Motives* of Religion are, what *Ends* a Man, as a *moral* Agent, ought to propose: and *then* have prov'd as plainly that Reason is or ought to be sufficient to acquire a full and satisfactory Knowledge of them. But instead of doing any thing like *that*, he touches this Article but superficially, says very little about it, and in truth had better have said nothing at all.

In p. 4, 5. he argues that “ *Man in his natural State — has a Right to be invested with such a Capacity as is sufficient — to discover such Motives to a*

† How defective the heathen Morality was in this respect, is taken notice of by Mr. Lock in the following Words; “ Those
“ just Measures of Right and Wrong, which Necessity had any
“ where introduc'd, the civil Laws prescrib'd, or Philosophy
“ recommended, stood not on their true Foundations. They
“ were looked on as Bonds of Society, and Conveniencies of
“ common Life, and laudable Practices. But where was it,
“ that their Obligation was thoroughly known and allowed, and
“ they receiv'd as Precepts of a Law; of the highest Law, the
“ Law of Nature? That could not be, without a clear Know-
“ ledge and Acknowledgment of the Lawmaker, and the great
“ Rewards and Punishments, for those that would or would not
“ obey him.” *Vol. II. p. 534.*

“ *right Behaviour, as are an equal Balance to all*
 “ *those Temptations, the present Constitution of Things*
 “ *unavoidably leads him into.*” Exceeding lame!
 worse than the old Stoical Notion of Virtue’s being
 its own Reward; nay, destructive of the very Na-
 ture and Essence of Virtue! You remember the
 old Problem of an Ass between two Bundles of
 Hay of equal Goodness and Weight. Is not this
 something like it? Suppose a Man to be under
 Temptations to an Act *materially* evil, and to have
 Motives dissuading him from it, of *just Weight*
enough to counterbalance these Temptations; what
 will be the Consequence? It must be entirely in-
 different to him, whether he *does*, or *forbears* doing
 it. There is no room to choose, *i. e.* to prefer
 either before the other; much less is there room to
 make a *virtuous* Choice.

I meet with but one Passage more; “ *If the*
 “ *Knowledge and Certainty of these* [the Resurrection
 of the Body and a Judgment to come; a future
 State of Rewards and Punishments, and the Per-
 petuity of these] “ *are necessary to engage Mankind*
 “ *in the Practice of their Duty; — and if Reason is*
 “ *incapable of making such Discoveries: then, I say,*
 “ *that in Justice and Equity it ought however to be*
 “ *sufficient for these Purposes:*” p. 22. To which
 there is no need of making any Reply, because it
 neither proves, or so much as affirms any thing
categorically. A strange Way of managing a Con-
 troversy!

Having thus produc’d the two only Passages
 reducible to this Head, and neither of them appear-
 ing of any Weight, I might now plead the Privi-
 ledge of a *Defendant*, and call for better and more
 substantial Proofs; and if such cannot be brought
 for the *Affirmative*, ’tis only *gratis dictum*, and
 there is no Reason why we should admit it for true.
 However, I will throw in a few Observations *ex*

abun-

abundanti, which plead strongly in Favour of the opposite Side.

Mr. C. is very much upon the Reserve, and conceals what his Opinion is; but if it be, that Reason is, or ought to be sufficient to discover the Certainty of a Resurrection and a *perpetual* State of Rewards and Punishments hereafter, 'tis easy to put him into a Way how to determine, whether it is sufficient to do this, or no; only I would desire him not to impeach the Justice and Equity of God, if in the Issue it should appear that it is not. He has Reason in common with the Heathens, and having had Information from the Bible concerning these Points, is much better qualify'd to prove the Certainty of them by just Inferences from the Nature of Things, than if he had been bred up in a State of Heathenism. He may then try what he can do. Let him call forth all the Powers of his Soul, and exert the utmost of his Skill in the Argument; and if he succeeds, he will greatly oblige the Christian World. But 'tis easy to perceive what the Issue will be. We may well despair of seeing these Points made certain in the Way of *Reason*, since nothing like it has ever been done. What a late excellent Writer has urg'd to his Adversary, is applicable to Mr. C. * “ Let him now
 “ at this Day, after the latest Improvements in
 “ Philosophy and moral Science, try if he can
 “ from mere *Reason* demonstrate any thing more
 “ than this, that there will be some *Difference* in
 “ another World between the *more* and *less* sinful,
 “ (all being *Sinners*) without determining *what* it
 “ will be, or *how long* it will last. I am per-
 “ suaded, when he sets his *Bible* aside, he will not
 “ be able to prove more than I have mention'd.
 “ I am certain he can prove little or nothing of

* Supplement to the Treatise, entitled, &c. p. 56.

" Rewards ; because we have none of us a full
 " Claim or strict Right to any. Happy is he that
 " is to have the slightest Punishment : So stand we
 " upon the Foot of mere natural Religion."

I may here remark what Knowledge the old Heathens had of these Matters. A Resurrection does not appear to have been an Article of Faith with any of them, except the Magian Sect in Persia, and some other Countries in the East ; and they had it from * Zoroastres, who had it from the Jews. Pythagoras probably deriv'd it from the same Fountain ; but he did not carry it pure and uncorrupt into Greece, but gave it a † Mixture that spoil'd all : And his Notion of a Transmigration, which prevail'd with vast Multitudes, as well as that about the Restoration of all Things to their present State at the End of the Platonic Year, is inconsistent with this great Truth. When Christianity began to spread in the World, the Doctrine of a Resurrection was a Stumbling-block to many, and the most ingenious Adversaries, the Christians had to deal with, || constantly made use of it, as a Handle against them, and by way of Reproach. Celsus in particular scoffingly says, § " For those that have
 " been long dead to rise again with those Bodies,
 " this is but the Hope of Worms, a vile, abomi-
 " nable, and impossible thing:" And before his

* Prideaux's Connection, Part I. p. 305. Tenth Edit.

† Sic etiam conditionem renascendi sapientium clariores, Pythagoras primus, & præcipuus Plato corrupta & dimidiata fide tradiderunt. Nam corporibus dissolutis solas animas volunt & perpetuò manere, & in alia nova corpora sæpius commeari. Addunt istis & illa ad retorquendam veritatem, in pecudes, aves, belluas, hominum animas redire. Min. Felix. p. 28.

|| Ut carnis restitutio negetur, de una omnium Philosophorum schola sumitur. Tertull. de Præscrip. adv. Her. cap. 7. In nulla re tam vehementer, tam pertinaciter, tam obnixè & contentiosè contradicitur Fidei Christianæ, sicut de carnis resurrectione. August. in Psal. 88. Concio 2.

§ See Origen contra Celsum, l. 5. p. 240.

Time, a more sober Writer had represented the Resurrection as an * *Impossibility*. Nevertheless, GOD's Omnipotence is Proof enough that it *may* be, and from his Veracity we conclude it *will*. This is the only Way, whereby to prove it; and whoever makes the Experiment will soon find himself at a *Non-plus* in the Way of *Reason*. Dr. Clarke has observ'd, that † “ This Doctrine is not discoverable with any kind of Certainty by the bare “ Light of Nature;” and another learned Author, who was willing to have prov'd it by *Reason*, and has push'd the Matter from several Topics as far as it will go, is forc'd at last to acknowledge, || “ We know nothing of these Matters but from “ the Scriptures; all besides is only Conjecture.” I may add, that if Reason could make it appear probable, that dead Bodies will be rais'd again, yet it could discover nothing of those glorious *Changes* to be made in them, which the Gospel teaches; and considering how imperfect our Virtue is in this Life, there might be some Doubt, whether this Resurrection would not be in order to § *another Tryal and Probation*.

Then, as to an *eternal* State of Rewards and Punishments, the wisest of them spake *doubtfully* of it; and *Simmius* in *Plato* tells his Master *Socrates*, there was no Likelihood of their getting over their

* Ne Deum quidem posse omnia. Namque nec sibi potest mortem consciscere, si velit: — nec mortales æternitate donare, aut revocare defunctos. *Plin. Nat. Hist.* l. 2. c. 7.

† Clarke's Evidences, p. 278.

|| Jenkin's Reasonableness, Vol. II. p. 454.

§ Thus the *Siamese* maintain, that the Soul undergoes several Transmigrations, till by a great number of good Deeds in all the Lives, she acquires so much Merit, that there is not in any World any mortal State that is worthy of her; and then she transmigrates no more, but remains eternally in Repose, enjoying all the Happiness she is capable of. See *Harris's Collection of Voyages*, Vol. II. p. 483, 484.

Doubts, without some better Light than that of Reason. The Passage is very remarkable, and shews clearly the Extravagancy of our modern *Deists*, and how far they are departed from the Sense of the *old Heathens*, in magnifying the Strength of Reason beyond due Bounds, and maintaining its Sufficiency for such Purposes, as the *Philosophers* (who were the best Judges in the Case) did not find it in *Fact* and by *Experience* capable of answering, and therefore wanted and wish'd for some better Light, some reveal'd Word of God, to guide and direct them. * “ I agree with you, O *Socrates*, “ that 'tis quite impossible, or at least very difficult, “ to discover the certain Truth of these Things “ [the Immortality of the Soul and a Life to come] “ in this present Life; and yet, that 'tis a Sign of “ an indolent and mean Spirit, not to examine into “ what may be said about them, or to desist from “ our Inquiry, before we have carry'd it as far as “ ever we can. For one of these Things we ought “ to do; either to learn the Truth from others, “ or to find it out ourselves, or (if both these “ Ways fail us) to pitch upon the most plausible “ Opinion, which we find any where amongst “ Mankind, and so to venture upon that Bottom, “ as in a Ship, to pass thro' the Storms of this “ Life: Unless one could meet with a still safer “ Passage, or be conducted more securely; as,

* Ἐμοὶ γὰρ δοκεῖ, ὦ Σώκρατες, πρὸς τῶν τοιούτων ἴσως, ὥστε καὶ οἱ τὸ μὲν σαφὲς εἶδέναι ἐν τῷ νῦν βίῳ, ἢ ἀδύνατον εἶναι, ἢ παγχαλεπόν π. Τὸ μὲν οἱ τὰ λεγόμενα πρὸς αὐτῷ, μὴ καὶ παντὶ τέτρω ἐλέγχειν, καὶ περὶ αἰσάσθαι πρὸς αὐτὸν πανταχοῦ σκοπῶν ἀποστήσῃ τις, πάντῃ μαλ' αὐτῷ εἶναι ἀνδρός. Δεῖν γὰρ πρὸς αὐτὰ ἐν γὰρ π τέτρω διατρέξασθαι, ἢ μαθεῖν ὅτι ἔχει, ἢ εὐρεῖν ἢ εἰ ταῦτα ἀδύνατον, καὶ γὰρ βέλπετον τῷ ἀνθρώπινον λόγον λαβόντα καὶ συνεξελεγκτότατον, ἐπὶ τέτρω ὁχλῶμεν, ὥστε ἐπὶ σχεδία, κινδυνὸν ἢ διαπλευσάσθαι τ' εἶον· εἰ μὴ τις δύνασθαι ἀσφαλέστερον καὶ ἀκινδυνότερον, ἐπὶ βεβαιότερον ὁχλῶμασθαι ἢ λόγῳ δεῖν πρὸς, διατρέξασθαι. *Plato in Phaedon*, p. 388.

“ for

“ for Instance, we might by some Revelation or
 “ supernatural Notices from GOD.” Cicero tells
 us how the Philosophers differ’d even about the
 Soul’s Subsistence * after Death ; some believing
 it was immediately dissipated ; others that it con-
 tinued in Existence for a limited Time only ; and
 others again, that it would exist for ever. He
 takes notice also of their Differences about the
 † Nature of the Soul, or what it is, and having
 reckon’d up ten several Opinions, — that it is
 “ the Heart, the Blood, Part of the Brain, the
 “ Breath, Fire, Harmony, a mere Nothing, a
 “ Self-moving Number, an intelligent Substance,
 “ a fifth Essence,” he declares in his own Person,
 || “ Which of these Opinions is the true one, none
 “ but GOD can tell ; which is the most probable
 “ is a great Question.” He shews however, that
 according to the seven first of these Opinions, no-
 thing either good or evil can happen after Death.
 The three last, he tells the Person he holds the
 Dialogue with, § “ afford *some Hope*, if this be
 “ any Satisfaction, that Souls after they are sepa-
 “ rated from the Body may *possibly go to Heaven* ;”
 for a Proof of which he refers him to *Plato* : But
 the other replies, ** “ I have read *Plato* often

* Sunt, qui discessum animi a corpore putent esse mortem.
 Sunt, qui nullum censeant fieri discessum, sed unà animum, &
 corpus occidere, animumque in corpore extingui. Qui discedere
 animum censent, alii statim dissipari, alii diu permanere, alii sem-
 per. *Tusc. Quæst. l. i.*

† Quid sit ipse animus, — magna dissensio est. *Ibid.*

|| Harum sententiarum quæ vera sit, Deus aliquis viderit : quæ
 verisimillima, magna quæstio est. *Ibid.*

§ Reliquorum sententiæ spem afferunt, si te fortè hoc delectat,
 posse animos, cum è corporibus excesserint, in cœlum, quasi in
 domicilium suum, pervenire. *Ibid.*

** Feci mehercule, & quidem sæpius, sed nescio quo modo,
 dum lego, assentior : cum posui librum, & mecum ipse de im-
 mortalitate animorum cœpi cogitare, assensio omnis illa elabitur.
Ibid.

“ enough,

“ enough, yet I know not how it is; whilst I read,
 “ I yield my Assent, and seem convinc'd of what
 “ he argues; but when I lay aside the Book, and
 “ begin to think the Matter over by myself, and
 “ in my own Way of *Reasoning*, my old *Doubts*
 “ recur, and all my Conviction presently *vanishes*.”

To this may be added what *Seneca* observes, that
 † “ the greatest Philosophers rather *promis'd* Men
 “ they are immortal, than *prov'd* they are so.”
 It is plain then they had no *full* Assurance, no *cer-*
tain Knowledge or Demonstration, nothing more
 than glimmering Hopes, uncertain Guesſes, and
 probable Expectations as to this Matter; and even
 these don't appear to have been owing *altogether* or
originally to mere natural Reason, but either to
 the Remains of antient *Revelations*, handed down
 from the first Ages after the Flood, or to some
 new Light deriv'd from the People of the *Jews*.

‡ “ What confirms it is, that it was more firmly
 “ believ'd by the *Vulgar* than it was by the *Philo-*
 “ *sophers*; who by *reasoning* upon it, only render'd
 “ it more *doubtful* than before, as they wanted
 “ *certain* Principles to go upon, and consider'd not
 “ how to trace the *Tradition* up to its Fountain
 “ Head.” Agreeably to this, *Plato* witnesses that
 the Doctrines of the Soul's Immortality, and of
 a Judgment to come, were handed to them by
 § old and venerable *Tradition*, and he asserts the
 Credibility of them upon that Score. In like
 manner he introduces *Socrates* teaching these Prin-

† Credebam faciliè opinionibus magnorum virorum, rem gra-
 tissimam promittentium magis, quam probantium. *Senec.*
Ep. 102.

‡ See *Postscript* to *Scripture vindicated*. Part II. p. 151.

§ Πείθεσθαι ὃ ἔπος αἰεὶ χρὴ τοῖς παλαιαῖς τε καὶ ἱεροῖς λόγοις,
 οἱ δὲ μνηύουσιν ἡμῖν ἀθάνατον ψυχὴν εἶναι. διγασὶς τε ἶχεν, καὶ
 πίπεν τὰς μεγίστας πηλείδας, ὅταν τις ἀπαλαχθῇ τῷ σώματι.
Ep. 7. p. 716.

ciples upon the Foot of * *Tradition*; and farther, he represents him as telling his Scholars, that the † Antients, who liv'd nearer the Gods than they did, had left them many Traditions, which he was a great Admirer of, as the best Helps in the Search after Truth, and that he was grievously perplex'd and full of Doubts, whenever *these Traditions* fail'd him. Cicero also takes notice, that the Notion of the Soul's Immortality was deliver'd down from || all *Antiquity*, and that this was Ground enough for the Belief of it; because those, who liv'd nearest the Beginning of the World; were most likely to know the Truth: Yet he observes withal, that none of the † Antients before *Plato* ever *reason'd* upon the Point, or brought any *Arguments* to prove it by. *Pherecydes* and *Pythagoras* had § taught it very early, at the first Dawning of Philosophy in *Greece*; having, beside the Advantage of antient *Tradition*, had fresh Instructions about it, as is very probable, from the *Jewish*

* Ἀλλε μάλα καλὲ λόγος. ὃν σὺ μὲν ἰήσῃ μῦθον, ὡς ἐγὼ οἶμαι. ἐγὼ δὲ λόγον. ὡς ἀληθεῖ γὰρ ὄντα σοὶ λέξω ἃ μέλλω λέγειν. — Ἰδὲ οὖν νόμος. ὅδε περὶ ἀνθρώπων ἐπὶ Κρόνῳ, καὶ αἰὲ καὶ νῦν ἐπὶ ἐστὶν ἐν θεοῖς. ἥρ' ἀνθρώπων τ' μὲν διαίτας τ' εἶον διελέγιστα καὶ ὁσίως, ἐπειδὴν τελευτήσῃ, εἰς μακάρων νήσους ἀπόηα, οὐκ εἶν ἐν πάσῃ ἀδαιμονία ἐκτὸς χακῶν. τ' δὲ ἀδίκως καὶ ἀδείως, εἰς τὸ τ' πίστεως τε καὶ δίκης δεσμοτήθειον, ὃ δὴ τάρταρον καλεῖσιν, ἵέναι. In *Gorg.* p. 312. See also in *Phædon.* p. 398. compar'd with p. 400.

† In *Phileb.* p. 74.

|| Auctoribus ad istam sententiam [scil. immortalitatem animæ:] uti optimis possumus: quod in omnibus causis & debet, & solet valere plurimum: & primum quidem omni antiquitate; quæ quo propius aberat ab ortu & divina progenie, hoc melius ea fortasse, quæ erant, vera cernebat. *Tusc. Qu.* l. 1.

† Rationem illi [scil. antiqui] sententiæ suæ non ferè reddebant. — Platonem ferunt, ut Pythagoreos cognosceret, in Italiam venisse, & didicisse Pythagorea omnia: primumque de animorum æternitate non solum sensisse idem, quod Pythagoras, sed rationem etiam attulisse. *Ibid.*

§ *Ibid.*

Writings.

Writings. The former is said to have study'd the Books of the * *Phœnicians*, by which in all Likelihood were meant the Books of the *Jews*, who are well known to go under the Name of † *Phœnicians* in *Herodotus* and other Authors. || " That " the latter was acquainted with the *Mosaical* or " *Jewish* Philosophy, there is ample Testimony " of it in Writers: as of *Aristobulus* an *Egyptian* " *Jew* in *Clemens Alexandrinus* and *Josephus* against " *Appion*. St. *Ambrose* adds, that he was a *Jew* " himself. *Clemens* calls him * Ἑβραίων φιλο- " σοφόν, the *Hebrew* Philosopher. I might cast " hither the Suffrages of *Justin*, *Johannes Philo-* " *ponus*, *Theodoret*, *Hermippus* in *Origen* against " *Celsus*, *Porphyrus*, and *Clemens* again, who " writes that 'twas a common Fame that *Pytha-* " *goras* was a Disciple of the Prophet *Ezekiel*. " And tho' he gives no Belief to the Report, yet " that learned Antiquary Mr. *Selden* seems incli- " nable enough to think it true, in his first Book " *de Jure Naturali juxta Hebræos*: — Besides all " these, *Jamblicus* also affirms, that he liv'd at " *Sidon*, his native Country, where he fell ac- " quainted with the Prophets, and Successors of " one *Mochus*, the Physiologer or natural Philo- " sopher. Σωζόμενος τοῖς Μώχῃ τῷ Φυσιολόγῃ περὶ φήταις " ἀπογόνοις: which, as Mr. *Selden* judiciously con- " jectures, is to be read τοῖς Μωσείας τῷ Φυσιολόγῃ περ- " φήταις ἀπογόνοις, With the Prophets that suc- " ceeded *Moses* the Philosopher." However nei- " ther of these, nor any of their Successors for many " Generations philosophiz'd upon the Point, or at-

* *Stanley's Lives of the Philosophers*, p. 58.

† *Bocharti Phaleg*. l. 4. c. 34. *Hammond* on Matt. xv. 22. *Huet. Demonstr. Evang. Prop.* 4. De Lib. *Josue*, §. 13.

|| Dr. *H. More's Defence of the Cabb.* p. 185. See also *Cudworth's Intellectual System*, p. 12. *Huet. Demonstr. Evang. Prop.* 4. c. 2.

tempted to prove it by Deductions of Reason. *Plato* was the first, as I said before, that ever attempted to do this; and how he succeeded is obvious enough. Most of his Arguments are exceeding frivolous, and the best leave the Matter under great Uncertainty. *Dr. Cudworth* says, § “ It is a thing very
 “ well known, that according to the Sense of Phi-
 “ losophers, these two Things were always in-
 “ cluded together, in that one Opinion of the
 “ Soul’s Immortality, namely, its *Præ-existence*,
 “ as well as its *Post-existence*. Neither was there
 “ ever any of the Antients before Christianity,
 “ that held the Soul’s future Permanency after
 “ Death, who did not likewise assert its *Præ-ex-*
 “ istence; they clearly perceiving, that if it were
 “ once granted, that the Soul was generated, it
 “ could never be prov’d but that it might be also
 “ corrupted. And therefore the Assertors of the
 “ Soul’s Immortality commonly begun here; first,
 “ to prove its *Præ-existence*, proceeding thence
 “ afterward to establish its Permanency after
 “ Death. This is the Method us’d in *Plato*, *ὡς*
 “ *περὶ ἡμῶν ἡ ψυχὴ πρὶν εἶναι τὰς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἶδεν ἡρώδης,*
 “ *ὥστε καὶ ταύτη ἀθάνατον πείποιεν ἡ ψυχὴ τῇ.* Our Soul
 “ was somewhere, before it came to exist in this
 “ present human Form, and from thence it ap-
 “ pears to be immortal, and such as will subsist
 “ after Death.” The like Observation I find to
 have been made long ago by * *Lactantius*.

§ Intellectual System, p. 38.

* In eo ipso, quod rectè sentiebant, aliquid errarunt. Nam cum timerent argumentum illud, quo colligitur, necesse esse ut occidant animæ cum corporibus, quia cum corporibus nascuntur; dixerunt non nasci animas, sed insinuari potius in corpora, & de aliis in alia migrare. Non putaverunt aliter fieri posse, ut supersint animæ post corpora, nisi videantur fuisse ante corpora. — Nemo enim vidit, quod est verissimum, & nasci animas, & non occidere. *Lib. 3. c. 18.*

It may be just hinted, that Mr. C. says nothing about the *Nature* or *Measure* of the Rewards and Punishments hereafter, *wherein* they will consist, or *how great* and *intense* they will be: Which yet are Matters of Religion, have a strong Influence upon our Practice, and are of as much Use to be known, as their *Duration*; but there is no room to alledge, that the Light of Nature can lead to these Discoveries.

Upon the whole, considering how full of *Doubts* the Heathens generally were, and what *Uncertainties* these great Men, *Socrates, Plato, Cicero, &c.* after all their deepest Researches and Disquisitions labour'd under; considering further, how little even the most learned Christians can do toward demonstrating on the Foot of *Reason*, what they believe on the Credit of *Revelation*, it must be very strong and substantial Evidence indeed for the *Affirmative*, which shall draw me off from concluding *negatively*, — that Reason alone cannot get to a *Certainty*, that there will be another Life after this; much less that the Body will be *rais'd again*; and much less still, that it will be rais'd with so many and great *Alterations* for the better, as the Scriptures teach; ——— that whatever Evidence it may suggest of a Life to come, yet it cannot determine with *Certainty*, whether it will be a *final* State of Rewards and Punishments, or *another* State of Trial and Probation; that, supposing the next Life to be a State of Rewards and Punishments, it would still be at a Loss to know *what Duration* that State will be of, whether *eternal*, or only for a *limited* Time; and lastly, that over and above all the other perplexing Doubts and Uncertainties, it can know little or nothing either of the *Nature* or the *Measure* of the Rewards and Punishments of another Life; because these depend altogether
upon

upon the *Will* and *Pleasure* of the great Lord and Monarch of the World.

The LAST Head relates to the Way and Manner of *appeasing* GOD, after we have offended him by Trespasses and Sin. But before I go on to consider whether *Reason* be a sufficient Guide in this respect, 'tis necessary that I consider the false and fallacious Representation given by our Author of the *Scripture-Grounds* of our Reconciliation with GOD. He not only contends that Repentance and Reformation are proper Grounds and Reasons of GOD's shewing Mercy to Transgressors, and that Reason can discover them to be so, but also that they are the *only* proper Grounds of it; p. 17, 21. And in order to establish this Notion, he endeavours to overthrow the Doctrines of Christ's *Satisfaction* and *Faith* in his Blood, representing them as *repugnant to Reason*; And too hastily presuming they are so, he says with a Sneer, "*that Reason cannot possibly discover them is readily granted:*" p. 16. The Representation he gives of the Benefits we receive by Christ's Death, is, that "*he lost his Life in maintaining his Mission from God, and so by a Figure of Speech Men are said to be Sharers in the Benefits of Christ's Death, when they are Sharers in the Benefits of that divine Mission, which he laid down his Life to maintain:*" p. 20. A most wretched, lame, and imperfect Account of this most amazing Instance of the divine *Philanthropy*, and no more expressive of the Benefits resulting from the Death of *Christ*, than of any of the *Apostles*, who suffer'd Martyrdom in Testimony of their Mission, and of the Truth of the Gospel! It is to be wish'd he had express'd himself in a fuller manner, and told us more particularly what the Benefits are, that accrue to us from Christ's Mission. However, 'tis plain enough he will not allow that his Sufferings are *vicarious*, or that he

D

dy'd

dy'd in our stead, *i. e.* to free us from that Obligation to Punishment we were under, and could not deliver ourselves from. And yet this is no more than the holy Scriptures plainly teach. Christ is called ^a *the Lamb of God that taketh away the Sins of the World*; ^b *Our Passover sacrificed for us*; and ^c *the Propitiation for the Sins of the whole World*. He is said to have been ^d *delivered for our Offences*; to have ^e *given himself for us, an Offering and a Sacrifice to God*; to have ^f *purchased his Church with his own Blood*; to have ^g *reconciled us to his Father in the Body of his Flesh through Death*; and to have ^h *once suffered for Sins, the Just for the Unjust, that he might bring us to God*. We are assured that ⁱ *once in the End of the World he has appeared to put away Sin by the Sacrifice of himself*; that ^k *being come or made an High-priest of good things to come,—not by the Blood of Goats and Calves, but by his own Blood, he entered in once into the holy Place, having obtained eternal Redemption for us*; that ^l *God commendeth his Love towards us, in that while we were yet Sinners, Christ died for us*; that ^m *when we were Enemies, we were reconciled to God by the Death of his Son*; that he ⁿ *gave himself a Ransom for all*; that ^o *we have Redemption through the Blood of Christ, even the Forgiveness of our Sins*; that his Blood is the ^p *Blood of the New Testament or Covenant, which he shed for many*; that it ^q *cleanseth us from all Sin*: and many other Texts there are to the same Purpose. In truth, this is the uniform Doctrine of the Bible: And how must these and the like Passages be

^a John i. 29.^b 1 Cor. v. 7.^c 1 John ii. 2.^d Rom. iv. 25.^e Ephes. v. 2.^f Acts xx. 28.^g Col. i. 21, 22.^h 1 Pet. iii. 18.ⁱ Heb. ix. 26.^j Heb. ix. 11, 12.^k Rom. v. 8.^l Rom. v. 10.^m 1 Tim. ii. 6.ⁿ Ephes. i. 7.^o Matt. xxvi. 28.^p 1 John i. 7.

wrested, what *Figures* must they be *tortur'd* into, before they can be brought to speak the *low* Language of our Author's Hypothesis? If no other Benefit accrues from Christ's Death, than Mr. C. suggests, our Redemption may be ascrib'd to several *other*, and those stronger and more forcible Evidences of his divine Mission, as well as to *that*. The Accomplishment of old *Prophecies* relating to him, and of what himself *foretold*, is a cogent Proof that he came from GOD. The *Miracles* also perform'd by him, long enough before his *Passion*, are declar'd to have render'd the *Jews* * inexcusable, in that they did not accept and believe in him, as their Redeemer: And every one of these *Miracles*, and also his *Resurrection* afterwards from the Dead, was a much better Proof of his Mission from GOD; than barely his *dying* in Defence of it. And yet, 'tis never said, that we are *redeem'd* by the fulfilling of *Prophecies*; that *any* of Christ's *Miracles*, the raising *Lazarus*, the curing those that were possess'd of Devils, &c. are a *Propitiation* for our Sins; or that he was a *Sacrifice* for us by *rising* from the dead; tho' *all* this is frequently affirm'd with respect to his *Death* and *Sufferings*.

But 'tis alledg'd, that " *nothing can be more repugnant to Reason, than that God should remove his Displeasure from one Person that is guilty, by [in Consideration of] the Sufferings of another that is innocent, because this would be to punish the Innocent, that thereby he might take occasion to let the Guilty go free; than which nothing can be more unequal and unreasonable.*" p. 16. I see no Reason why the Sufferings, which Christ underwent in our stead, and to rescue us from the Penalties we were subject to, may not pass under the Denomination of *Punishment*. There is nothing in the *ten*

* John xv. 22, 24.

Letters of that Word to hinder it, and the learned
 * *Grotius* has fully shewn, from the Usages of the
 most civiliz'd Heathens in antient Times, that this
 is far enough from a *novel* Acceptation of it. The
 sole End of Speech is to be understood, and enow
 Writers, who maintain Christ was *punish'd*, have
 been careful to explain what they intend thereby,
 and have desir'd to be understood in this *qualify'd*
 Sense. There is another Meaning of the Word,
stricter and more *rigid*, importing *personal* Guilt in
 the Sufferer, and his being under the *Displeasure* of
 the Lawgiver; in which Sense there is no room to
 say Christ was *punish'd*; because he was never
 dearer to God, than whilst he was under the acutest
 Agonies of his Passion. And indeed no Person
 whatever, *consider'd* as *innocent*, ever was or will
 be *punish'd* in this Sense; not because the Thing is
unjust, but for a *prior* Reason, because 'tis an *abso-*
lute Impossibility and a *Contradiction* in Terms, which
 has the Privilege of *Non-sense*, that neither Good
 nor Evil, Justice nor Injustice can be *predicated* of
 it. Now considering this Ambiguity of the Word,
 'tis strange Mr. C. should be so forward to intro-
 duce it into the Dispute, when 'twas not in the
 Objection he undertook to solve, and which he
 might have given as distinct a Solution to, without
 the help of this Term, as with it; and more espe-
 cially that he should lug it in, without explaining
 in *what* Sense he uses it, but instead thereof, affix-
 ing sometimes *one* Idea to it, sometimes *another*,
 as I apprehend he does. For when he says that
 " God's removing his Displeasure from one Person that
 " is guilty, by the Sufferings of another that is innocent,
 " would be to punish the Innocent," &c. here the
 Word *Punishment* must be understood in the *former*
 Sense only; otherwise there is no Appearance of

* De Satisfactione, cap. 4.

Truth in it: And yet, when he says, “ *to punish the Innocent is unequal and unreasonable,*” he must understand it in the *latter* Sense, or he can never prove what he asserts. ’Tis necessary therefore that he should come out of the Clouds, and that the Matter be set in a fair Light. In order to which I would ask one Question: Have all *vicious* Sufferings the Nature and Essence of *Punishments*? If not, ’tis disingenuous and mere Sophistry to run the Ideas one into the other, as our Author does; because then the Tortures our Lord underwent may be consider’d as *natural* Evils only, not *penal*. He might be *afflicted*, without being *punish’d*; and in this View ’tis impossible he could have any Injustice done him, as I will shew presently. If they have, ’tis all one, whether we consider Christ to have undergone *Punishment*, to free us from that Obligation to be punish’d which we lay under, or to have *suffer’d* in our stead and with *that* Intent; because then there is exactly the same Degree of Injustice in *both* Cases, and no more in *either* than is in the *other*. If then it can be made appear, that there was no Injustice done Christ under the *latter* Supposition, it follows, by unavoidable Consequence, there could be none done him under the *former*. And as to this, there is no Difficulty at all in it: For the same Scriptures, which tell us we have Redemption thro’ the Blood of Christ, tell us farther, that he * *came to give his Life a Ransom for many*; that he † *loved us, and gave himself for us, an Offering and a Sacrifice to God*. ‡ *No Man, says our Saviour, taketh my Life from me; but I lay it down of myself. I have Power, &c.* Authority to lay it down. But Mr. C. goes on: “ *To say that the Person who suffer’d, voluntarily undertook to bear that Burden, does not alter*

* Matt. xx. 28.

† Ephes. v. 2.

‡ John x. 18.

“ the Case at all : because it makes no real Alteration
 “ neither in the Sufferer nor in the Sinner : that is,
 “ neither of them is more or less guilty or innocent upon
 “ that Account.” P. 16. Yes, it alters the Case
 entirely. For what if neither of the Parties was
 more or less sinful by this Means ? There was
 nevertheless an Alteration made, and a very material
 Circumstance chang'd. For Christ, who was
 not originally oblig'd to undergo any Evil, and of
 whom, according to the Order of our Ideas, it
 must be conceiv'd that *once* he had not *consented* to
 undergo any, did *at length* in some subsequent Point
 of Duration, out of his Love for us, and in Consideration
 of the *Joy that was set before him*, as a *Re-*
compence of Reward, *subject* himself to it, and make
 it his *Choice* to suffer in our stead : And no other
 Change than this was any ways needful in the Case.
 For the most innocent Person, supposing him to be
 at his own Disposal, as our blessed Saviour undoubtedly
 was, may *agree* to undergo what himself
 never *deserv'd* ; and 'tis contrary to all the Sense
 and Reason of Mankind to call those Sufferings
injurious or *unjust*, which the Sufferer might and
 did deliberately *chuse* to undergo, and which had
 never been laid upon him, without his *Consent* first
 had and freely given. 'Tis an old and sound Apho-
 rism, *Volenti non fit Injuria*, nor can the Sufferings
 of Christ, as an innocent Person, be freed from the
 Imputation of Injustice even upon the *Socinian*, or
 any other Hypothesis, but from the Consideration
 of his *Consent*, imply'd at least, if not expressly
 given.

In the next Paragraph he levels all his Artillery
 against the *Antinomian* Sense only of Christ's Satis-
 faction, without offering a Syllable in Opposition
 to it, as maintain'd by our best Divines : And yet
 in Reason *their* Explication might have challeng'd
 his chiefest Regard, being irreconcilable with the
 crude

crude Account he gives of the Benefits resulting from Christ's Death. I leave you to judge, whether this is becoming a fair and candid Writer. In GOD's Name, let the Love of Truth be uppermost in all our Disquisitions. Let no one make a Shew of overthrowing any *general* Point of Doctrine, when he has nothing to object to, but some Men's *particular* Way of explaining it, and when there is another Explication of it, sound and irrefragable, which he dares not so much as mention, for fear of exposing his Nakedness to the Eye of every Reader. What Mr. C. says of Justice in *general*, and without attending to the necessary Distinctions in the Case, is true only of the *outward* Exercise of one *particular* Species of it, call'd *punitive*, and that too, consider'd *separately* and by itself, viz. that "it consists in two Points; first, in punishing the Offender, and him only; and, secondly, in proportioning the Punishment to the Demerit of the Crime; and to depart from these, or either of them, is to depart from Justice." P. 17. But GOD's *punitive* Justice never was, or will be executed upon any one in the *abstracted* Manner Mr. C. considers it, being constantly *regulated* by those *other* Attributes, Wisdom and Goodness. He might have known therefore, that there is what is call'd *universal* Justice; which in GOD is *that Rectitude*, whereby he always acts according to the Perfection of his Nature, and never does any thing, but what 'tis most becoming him to do. This is what *Aristotle* must be understood to speak of, when he calls Justice a * *Mean* between doing and receiving an Injury. 'Tis mention'd in all our Books of Ethicks and Systems of Divinity. *Puffendorf* having said, that Men are not generally agreed about the *Division* of Justice, goes on to observe that the most

* Ethic. lib. 5. c. 5.

receiv'd * Distinction is between *universal* and *particular* Justice. And of the *former* of these our most noted Writers would be understood to speak in this Argument. — Again, Mr. C. misrepresents the Nature of our Lord's *Satisfaction*, alledging it leaves “ *no Place for the Exercise of God's Mercy,*” and implies that Christ's “ *Sufferings bear an exact Proportion to the Demerit of our Crimes.*” P. 17. The *Bishop* of *London* has said nothing, which so much as casts a Look this Way. He maintains the Doctrine of Christ's Satisfaction; but these Consequences flow only from the *Antinomian* Sense of it, which his *Lordship* is so far from espousing, that what he says is utterly inconsistent with it. Where then is the Sincerity of our Author? Where his Candor and Regard for Truth? He proclaims in the Title-Page, that his *Discourse* was occasion'd by the *Second Pastoral Letter*. He opposes the Doctrine of Christ's Satisfaction, and in describing the Manner of our Redemption runs counter to, and contradicts what his *Lordship* has taught concerning *that* Satisfaction; and yet, when he comes to argue the Point, his Reasoning is *wholly* levell'd against the *Antinomian* Sense of it, which the *Bishop* as little approves of, as he does himself. A more flagrant Instance of Unfairness has seldom been met with, and Mr. C. might have known himself better, than to have abus'd and mal-treated his *Lordship* in this Manner. Our Author argues in the same Manner *Socinus* did, and therefore what *Bishop Stillingfleet* said of the one may be apply'd to the other: † “ It is easy to observe that his Arguments are levell'd against an Opinion, “ which few who have consider'd these Things

* De Officio Homini, &c. l. i. c. 2. §. 14.

† Vol. III. p. 245. See also *Ger. Vossii Respons. ad judicium Ravenspergeri*, tom. 6. p. 888, 9.

“ do maintain, and none need think themselves
“ oblig’d to do it : which is, that Christ paid a
“ proper and rigid Satisfaction for the Sins of Men,
“ consider’d under the Notion of Debts, and that
“ he paid the very same which we ought to have
“ done, which in the Sense of the Law is never
“ call’d Satisfaction, but strict Payment.” In
another Place speaking of those who deny that
Christ was an adequate Price or a Sacrifice to the
Justice of GOD. * “ They run, *says he*, upon
“ the Notion of Debts and Payments, as tho’
“ there were no other Notion of Justice and Satis-
“ faction, but between Creditors and Debtors, or
“ as if their Notions of these Things were rather
“ taken from the *Shops* than the *Schools*.”

You will ask then, what is the true Doctrine
in this Case ? In Archbishop *Tillotson’s* Words,
|| “ Not that our Saviour suffer’d the very same
“ that the Sinner should have suffer’d, namely,
“ the proper Pains and Torment of the Damn’d,
“ but that his Obedience and Sufferings were of
“ that Value and Esteem with GOD, and his vo-
“ luntary Sacrifice of himself so well-pleasing to
“ him, that he thereupon entered into a Covenant
“ of Grace and Mercy with Mankind, wherein
“ he hath engag’d himself to forgive the Sins of
“ those who believe and repent, and to make them
“ Partakers of eternal Life.” Like to which is
the Account Dr. *Clarke* gives of it : § “ The Sa-
“ tisfaction made to GOD does not consist in this,
“ that the Sufferings of him who makes Satisfac-
“ tion, be exactly the *same* with the Punishment
“ due to him, for whom Satisfaction is made :
“ but it consists in this ; that GOD, who ruleth
“ over all, is pleas’d to *accept* the voluntary Suf-

* P. 235.

|| Vol. I. p. 560.

§ Exposition of the Ch. Catechism, p. 79.

“ ferings of our Saviour, as a sufficient *Vindication*
 “ of his supreme Authority : So that upon the
 “ Merit of that Sacrifice, he can, consistently with
 “ the *Honour* and *Dignity* of his Laws, accept the
 “ Repentance of returning Sinners, and *freely* for-
 “ give them their past Sins.” And a multitude
 of other Authors there are, who teach the same
 Thing.

And if this be true Scripture Doctrine, that
 GOD'S Justice, or, to speak more distinctly, that
 the just and righteous GOD, who always does what
 is right and fitting to be done, was satisfy'd by the
 Death of Christ, and accepted it in lieu of the Pu-
 nishment, we were liable to for our Sins ; what
 should hinder but that *Faith* in Christ, as having
 thus redeem'd us, should be made a *Condition* of
 our Forgiveness ? It matters not whether Mens
 believing, in the *abstracted* Sense of it, “ renders
 “ them at all more pleasing to God :” Only it may
 be observ'd that the same Argument, by which
 Mr. C. would prove, p. 20. that it does not, does
 equally evince, that Humility, the Love of GOD
 and of our Neighbour, Hatred of Sin, and setting
 our Affections on Things above, not on Things on
 the Earth, are no proper Grounds of GOD'S Lov-
 ing-kindness to us ; because in *all these Instances*,
 consider'd *abstractedly*, the Mind is altogether as
passive, and as far from *free Agency*, as 'tis in
believing. But what the great Use of this Way of
 Reasoning is, I cannot see. That Faith, which is
 the Duty of a Christian, is not to be taken in a
strict Philosophical Sense, but it signifies, in the
moral Sense, * “ That good Disposition of the
 “ Mind and Will, by which a Man, laying aside
 “ all Vice and Prejudice and corrupt Inclinations,
 “ chuses to *attend to*, and *examine*, and *consider*, and

* Clarke's Exposition, p. 33.

“ receive willingly, whatever upon due Enquiry he
 “ shall find to be the Will of GOD: And when
 “ he has so receiv’d it, not carelessly and *credu-*
 “ *lously*, but upon sober Reason and good Evi-
 “ dence; he adheres to it stedfastly, as a *Principle*
 “ or rational *Ground* of Action, by which he is
 “ uniformly to be directed.” In particular it in-
 cludes, that we renounce all Thoughts of *Merit* in
 ourselves, and trust not in *our* good Actions for
 the Pardon of our bad ones; that we never apply
 to *Saints* and *Angels* to be our Advocates, and en-
 tertain no Hopes from their Intercession with GOD
 for us; that we rely only upon the divine Mercy
 thro’ *Christ* for Forgiveness, and have an *Affiance*
 in the Sufficiency of the Satisfaction *be* made for Sin.
 This is the proper Notion of Christian Faith, and
 ’tis so far from being repugnant to Reason, that
 GOD should make it, thus understood, a Condi-
 tion of his Favour, that we are fully assur’d from
 the Scriptures that he has done it. And this is one
 Advantage we have from Revelation, above what
 we ever could have obtain’d without it. For as
 the Light of Nature could never have led Men to
 any Discovery of this kind, so neither could it have
 afforded them any Certainty or full Assurance, that
 their Repentance and Reformation *alone*, and with-
 out any other Consideration, would avail to the
 Pardon of their Sins, and their Acceptance with
 GOD unto eternal Life: Which is the Point to be
 consider’d next.

’Tis alledg’d in p. 21. “ that Repentance and
 “ Reformation are proper Grounds of Forgiveness, is
 “ most evident to Reason when discover’d; and to say
 “ that Reason [Men by the Use of their reasoning
 “ Faculties] cannot discover what is most agreeable
 “ to itself [*i. e.* to Truth] when discover’d, is pre-
 “ suming a Point without the least Ground for it.”
 ’Tis observable, Mr. C. speaks of it, as a Thing
 he

he very well knows, that it *has* been discover'd that Repentance and Reformation, *exclusive* of the Satisfaction Christ has made, are proper [adequate] Grounds of Forgiveness. But *when* or *where* this has been done, I don't apprehend. If he has had any special Revelation about it, he must produce his Credentials. If he thinks 'tis discover'd or reveal'd in Scripture, he might have cited the Passage, or at least made a Reference to it. But 'tis plain there is no such Text. The whole Gospel looks directly another Way, referring our Salvation to the Redemption we have in Christ Jesus. So that I conclude he goes upon a wrong Supposition, taking it for granted, that *That* is reveal'd in Scripture, which it never says a Syllable in Favour of, but constantly and uniformly teaches quite the Reverse.

Again, Suppose GOD *has* made the Discovery he speaks of; yet, *How* has he made it? Are the *positive* Grounds or Reasons reveal'd, by which it *must* be proper for GOD to forgive returning Sinners? No, I suppose Mr. C. will not pretend *that*, but infers *negatively*, that there are *no* Reasons why he should not forgive them, (which is the Point that the wisest Heathens chiefly stuck at, and never could make clear to themselves or others :) from its being reveal'd by GOD, who always does what is most becoming the Perfection of his Being, that he will do it; and then what he alledges will stand thus: If we may conclude that there are *no* Reasons, why returning Sinners should not be forgiven, from its being *reveal'd* by the all-wise and perfect Being, that he *will* forgive them; then we might have made the same Discovery that there are no such Reasons, *without* the Assistance of Revelation; which is as much as to say, if we know a Thing by the Help of the Bible, *then* or by *Consequence* we might have known it *without* that Help. — As to
the

the Allegation in the Close of the Sentence, viz. that “ to say that Reason could not have discover’d &c. “ is presuming a Point without the least Ground for “ it :” My Answer is, Mr. C. may call Things by what Names he pleases ; but the Intelligent know, that this cannot with any Truth or Justice be call’d *presuming*. ’Tis only adhering to the *Negative*, as in Reason we ought, till proper Evidence be brought for the *Affirmative*, which he has not yet *presum’d* to attempt, and never will be able to do. For however remote it may be from his Thoughts, what he drives at will unavoidably resolve into this ; that ’tis not in the Power of God Almighty to reveal any one Truth, relating either to the *Essences* or *Existences* of Things, and to make it appear fully consonant to our Reason, which we cannot discover without his Assistance, by the Exercise of our own Faculties.

’Tis added, “ And farther to say, that no Man, “ who was destitute of divine Revelation, ever did “ discern the Fitness of such a Conduct, viz. of pardoning a Transgressor upon his Repentance and “ Amendment of Life, is venturing to say what surely “ is not true. And if Reason may be suppos’d capable “ of discovering the Fitness of such Conduct, of which, “ I think, we may be certain that it is ; then Reason “ may come to a Certainty that this would be the Case, “ because Reason assures us, that God will always do “ what is right and fit.” P. 21. The Absurdity of all this will soon appear, by considering what our Author means by it. His Notion is, that such and such Actions “ are in themselves fit and right to be “ perform’d by every intelligent Being ; — which Fitness results solely from the Nature and Reasons of “ Things.” P. 34. And that “ as there is a Rule “ of Action founded in the Reason of Things ; so the “ moral Perfections of all intelligent Beings arise from, “ and consist in their being perfectly subjected to this “ Law.

“ *Law.* Thus, says he, the moral Perfection of the
 “ Deity consists in his being absolutely and perfectly
 “ subjected to this Law of Reason, [this Rule of
 “ Action founded in the Reason, or the Nature and
 “ Relations of Things:] that is, in his making the
 “ Reason [or Nature and Relations] of Things the
 “ Rule and Measure of his Affections and Actions.”

P. 57. So that when our Author argues that Reason is capable of discovering the Fitness of GOD's pardoning a Transgressor upon his Repentance, he means no less than that it can discover, that GOD is in *Duty bound*, and *oblig'd* in *Strictness of Law* to do it; and that 'tis absolutely *unlawful* in him to do otherwise. But whom can he name, that ever made such a Discovery? What Philosopher or acute Pagan can he instance in, that discern'd the *absolute* Fitness of such a Conduct, or that GOD would be *guilty* of going against the Reason of Things, and *violating* the Law of Nature, if he acted otherwise? He “ *thinks we may be certain*” Reason is capable of making this Discovery: But upon what Grounds does he think so? What *Data* has he to proceed, or build upon? By what Process of Argumentation is he satisfy'd of the *Negative*, that there are *no* wise Reasons rendering it unfit for GOD to forgive the Sins of Men upon the *bare* Consideration of their Repentance, or without any other Vindication of the Honour of his Laws? — *Manet alta mente repōstum*. Instead of being over-power'd with Light and Evidence, we are here left entirely in the dark, and the Oracle shuts up in fullen Silence. Dr. Clarke has well argued: † “ From the Consideration of the Goodness and
 “ Mercifulness of GOD, the Philosophers did indeed very *reasonably hope*, that GOD would shew
 “ himself placable to Sinners, and might be some

† Clarke's Evidences, &c. p. 182, 183.

“ way reconcil’d: But when we come to inquire
 “ more particularly, *what Propitiation* he will
 “ accept, and in *what Manner* this Reconciliation
 “ must be made; here Nature stops, and expects
 “ with Impatience the Aid of some particular
 “ Revelation. That GOD will receive returning
 “ Sinners, and accept of Repentance instead of
 “ perfect Obedience, *They cannot certainly know,*
 “ to whom he has not declar’d that he *will* do so.
 “ — For it cannot positively be prov’d from any
 “ of GOD’s Attributes, that he is *absolutely oblig’d*
 “ to pardon all Creatures all their Sins at all Times,
 “ barely and immediately upon their repenting.
 “ There arises therefore from Nature no *sufficient*
 “ Comfort to Sinners, but an anxious and endless
 “ Solicitude about the Means of appeasing the
 “ Deity.” The same Point is well argued and
 sufficiently evinc’d by * the *Bishop of London*:
 Whose Reasonings Mr. C. ought to have taken
 into Consideration, and distinctly reply’d to; but
 he contents himself with saying, “ *Surely it is not*
 “ *true*: — I think *we may be certain it is not*:”
 as if he purpos’d to bear down his *Lordship* with
Confidence and Assurance.

He goes on farther: “ *But admitting that Reason*
 “ *is incapable of discerning the Certainty of this Point,*
 “ *and that such Certainty is necessary to be discover’d,*
 “ *in order to engage Mankind in the Practice of their*
 “ *Duty under their present Circumstances; then, I*
 “ *say, that Reason ought to have been sufficient for*
 “ *this Purpose, seeing divine Revelation, which makes*
 “ *the Discovery, has been withheld from much*
 “ *the greatest Part of our Species.*” P. 22. Our
 Author speaks here within Compass. He might
 have said the Revelation making this Discovery
 has been withheld from the *whole Species*, unless

* Second Pastoral Letter, p. 14, 15.

perhaps himself must be excepted. St. Paul, 'tis plain, was so far from knowing any thing of it; that the very Reverse was reveal'd to him. *If, says he, there had been [* such] a Law given, which could have given Life, verily Righteousness [i. e. Justification to Life] should have been by the Law: But the Scripture has concluded all [Men of all Nations] under Sin, [and so under Condemnation by the Law moral, and ceremonial, and sentenced not to Life, but Death by it, and thereby shew'd the Necessity] that the Promise [of Justification] by Faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe in him.* Again, || *As many as are of the Works of the Law [and seek to be justify'd by them] are under the Curse [of it:] for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things, that are written in the Book of the Law to do them. But that no Man is justified by [Observance of] the Law in the sight of God, it is [farther] evident; for [the Prophet Habakkuk saith, ch. ii. 4.] the Just shall live by Faith.* The Apostle's Argument in these and many other Places against the *Mosaick Religion*; concludes *à fortiori* against that of *Nature*; and if no *Jew* was ever justify'd by the *Law*, much less can a mere *Heathen*, following a Rule of Action less perfect than the *Jews* had, be justify'd by that Rule, *exclusively* of what Christ has done and suffer'd for Sin. It is therefore an Excess of Kindness in Mr. C. which we never could have dreamt of, a piece of Extravagancy, which has neither Sense nor Reason in it, to admit that *the Certainty of this Point*, viz. God's pardoning sinful Creatures, upon the bare Consideration of their Repentance, *is necessary to be discover'd, &c.* He may oblige the *Deists* with this Concession, but no *Christian* ever did, or will desire it. If he pleases to admit that Reason

* See *Whitby* on Gal. iii. 21, 22.

|| V. 10, 11.

is incapable of discerning the Certainty of this Point, (as we have ample Grounds to believe it is,) we have no more to ask; because to admit this, and yet to argue that Reason *ought* to be sufficient for this Purpose, is arrant *Atheism*; it being inconsistent with the primary Idea we have of God, viz. that he is an all-perfect Being, to suppose that he has made the reasonable Soul of Man, or any other of his Creatures, otherwise than he *ought* to have made them.

I have now gone over the three Particulars before laid down, and I think I may very justly conclude that Mr. C. has been far from proving that Reason either *is* or *ought* to be sufficient in *any one* of these respects. You know well enough this Plea was first set on foot by the *Deists*, in order to overthrow our most holy Religion, and to prove it false by proving it useless: And therefore as Mr. C. would be thought to be well affected to Christianity, p. 29. (tho' 'tis plain he is a Christian of a very *peculiar* Make,) I wish he had consider'd the Matter more maturely, before he appear'd their *Second* in this Argument, or stood up in Maintenance of the *same* Plea. Whether the *Deists* can gain their Point against Revelation, even under the Supposition of Reason being a sufficient Guide, I have no occasion now to dispute. Be this as it will; 'tis certainly wrong to give an Adversary any Advantage, to allow him an Inch of Ground which he has no *apparent* Right to, or to permit him confidently to *assert* what he cannot *prove*: And 'tis the more imprudent in the present Case, because 'tis well known this boasted Sufficiency of Reason is the principal Ground, upon which many have renounced the Christian Faith, and run into *Deism*. He that builds upon, or affirms the Point, is, by the Rules of Disputation, oblig'd to prove it: Which if he fails of doing, it is only *gratis dictum*,
E

dictum, a groundless, unprov'd Assertion, and must pass for nothing. And as the Deists, whatever confident Affirmations they may have made use of, never brought any solid and substantial Evidence for it, so neither has Mr. C. their *Second* in this Argument.

But our Author has something still behind, worth considering. I have already observ'd that he does not pretend to prove *absolutely*, that Reason is, or ought to be sufficient, but proceeds *hypothetically*; that is to say, all his Arguments are of no Significance, unless it be allow'd him, that “ *Man* “ [every Individual] *in his natural State, when* “ *destitute of divine Revelation, is an accountable* “ *Creature, who is answerable to God for his Actions,* “ *and who will be amply rewarded or severely pu-* “ *nished in another World, according as he behaves* “ *himself in this.*” P. 4. But “ *admitting this to* “ *be the Case,*” he undertakes to do Wonders. Now I know not what Grounds he has to *suppose* this, or to take it for granted. Imagine *Weweena*, *Gbuckery*, and *Cousheda* to be bred up in a State of Nature: 'tis possible they may have no Religion at all, no Notion of a GOD, a Providence, or at least of another Life; in which Case we know not what will become of them hereafter: whether they will be annihilated, or placed in another State of Probation, or have the same Portion allotted them, with those who die in Infancy, or the like. But however it shall please GOD to dispose of them, 'tis plain they can have no *Right to Rewards*, and 'twill be difficult to shew they can be *proper* Objects of *Punishment*. This, I say, is *possible*, and if no Proof can be brought against it, (as undoubtedly there can be none,) *that* is enough for my Purpose. For, as I argued before, he that builds upon the opposite Opinion, is bound to prove it; and if the Foundation fail for want of Evidence, the Super-

+
structure

structure falls on course. Mr. C. therefore may try what he can do; but till I see his Reasons, and find them satisfactory and conclusive, what he *supposes* to be true, and takes for granted, shall pass with me for a * groundless Fancy.

Beside this, I may advance a Step farther, and consider his Notion about Man's being in a State of *Nature*, *strictly* so call'd, and *totally* destitute of the Aids of Revelation. Here again he will appear very fanciful, talking romantically, and without any Foundation in true History. "*If this were the Case,*" says he, *viz.* that Reason is not sufficient — and that Revelation was given to supply its Insufficiency, "*then the original Constitution of Things must have been very defective: — because then, there would have been a whole Species of Beings made accountable for their Actions, without being furnish'd with Capacities and Powers sufficient to answer the Purposes of such Creatures.*"

P. 12. I know not what *original Constitution of Things*, or what *whole Species of Beings* he speaks of; nor does he say *when* or *where* they liv'd: But he seems to speak of *Pre-Adamites*. If we take the *Mosaic Account*, the first Couple had the Advantage of Revelation both before and after the Fall, and their Progeny have not been *universally* without it ever since; consequently, admitting Reason not to be a sufficient Guide, it does not follow from thence that the *whole Species* in any Portion of Time since *Adam* have been destitute of Capacities, sufficient to answer the Purposes of accountable Creatures: And if this Writer has any authentick History of a Race of Men *before Adam*, 'tis a great Curiosity, and the World will be glad to know *how* he came by it.

* *Foster's Usefulness, &c.* p. 68.

'Tis immediately added, “ And then *numberless*
 “ *Millions of our Species would have been very un-*
 “ *equally and unkindly dealt with, because they have*
 “ *been destitute of such a divine Revelation, as would*
 “ *have supplied the Defect, which arose from the ori-*
 “ *ginal Constitution of Things.*” P. 13. How
 little this Passage is to the Point in hand, may
 easily enough be shewn; but I must stop a little
 to take notice of something else that is here sug-
 gested, and to shew the Groundlessness of it. The
 last Instance I have given of the Insufficiency of
 Reason, *viz.* that it cannot discover how GOD
 may be appeas'd, after he has been offended by
 Trespases and Sin, could not possibly arise from
 the *original Constitution* of Things; because this
 grand Defect is *super-induc'd* by Sin, and takes
 place only because Men forfeit their Innocence,
 and wilfully sin against GOD. So likewise in the
 second Instance: Man's Incapacity to discover,
wherein the Rewards of Virtue will consist, and
how long they will last, does not arise from any
positive Appointment or Determination of GOD,
 but is founded necessarily in the Things themselves;
 because these Rewards being the *free* Gift of GOD,
 nothing either of their Nature or Duration could
 be known without a Revelation from him. And
 what room there is to complain of unkind and un-
 equal Treatment on this Account, I cannot see.
 There can certainly be none at all; unless, *That*
 Reward, which GOD might have deny'd without
 Injustice to an *absolutely perfect* and *sinless* Saint, he
 was oblig'd in Justice to make Men naturally capa-
 ble of discovering, that their *imperfect* Obedience
 will meet with. And as to the Matter of human
 Duty, the Insufficiency of Reason for this Disco-
 very does not appear to have arisen from the *origi-*
nal Constitution of Things, or any *absolute* and *un-*
equal Purpose of GOD, but may be accounted for
 † from

from the *Corruption* of our Nature, introduced at first by the Fall of *Adam*, and ever since strengthened by Sin: which has a natural Tendency to debase the Mind, and enervate the Faculty of Understanding. The Humours of the Body have a strong Influence upon the Soul: and these Humours greatly depend upon the Stock, from whence the Body is deriv'd. And as 'tis observable that Children are frequently of like natural Tempers, Passions, and Inclinations with their Parents; so Experience shews what a Clog our Passions are in the Pursuit of Knowledge, and that in Proportion as our carnal Appetites are inflam'd, Reason is enfeebled and grows weaker. Mr. C. indeed apprehends, that "*Adam's discerning Faculty was so far from being impair'd, that on the contrary it was improv'd by his Transgression:*" p. 8. and he cites *Gen. iii. 6, 7, 22.* in Favour of this Notion. But to say nothing of Christian Writers, the antient Heathens would have taught him better: who, tho' they had not preserv'd the History of the *Fall*, and so were in the dark about the *Ground* and *Occasion* of Man's Corruption, yet were sensible enough that so unworthy a Composition did not come immediately out of the pure Hands of God, but that he subsisted once in a better and more glorious State. And in truth, the Man must be strangely chimerical, who can fancy that *Guilt* was necessary to raise us to that Perfection of Being we now have, or that our Nature would have been *more abject* and nearer to that of *Brutes*, if Sin and Wickedness had not happily interven'd, to purify our Souls and brighten our Understandings. That the Passages above-cited countenance no such Absurdity, I no ways question but you will readily grant: And since you know well enough what Interpretations our best Divines usually put upon these Texts, I will not trouble myself to repeat

them for the sake of this Author, who may read, if he pleases, as well as write. To come back to the Point in hand.

It matters not what Numbers have disbeliev'd the Revelations which GOD has given, or have been "*destitute*" of these Aids, unless they were *unavoidably* so. The Honour of the divine Attributes is sufficiently secur'd, and there is no Ground to complain of *unequal* Treatment, where Men have had Means and fair Opportunities of becoming acquainted with the reveal'd Will of GOD; because in this Case their continuing either in Ignorance or Infidelity arises wholly from their own Default. And if all such as these be left out of the Account, as they ought to be, Mr. C. I apprehend, is infinitely wide of the Truth in this Report, and will not be able to tell us, *where* or *when* those "*numberless Millions*" of People liv'd. He will find it no easy Matter to prove that any one Set of People under Heaven were ever *totally* debarr'd from supernatural Light, or so excluded from all Advantage by it, that they had no *Remains* of the first and most antient Revelations handed down to them by *Tradition*, nor any Means (if they had been ever so desirous) of becoming acquainted with those *later* Discoveries, which GOD has made of his Will. But Mr. C. imagines that none but *Jews* and profess'd *Christians* have had any Opportunities of becoming acquainted with Revelation, and that all others "have been very "unequally and unkindly dealt with," if Reason be not a sufficient Guide. This is evident from the Process of his Reasoning. "For as to the "Jewish Revelation, that was not intended to be a "Guide in Matters of Religion to all our Species, "but only to the Jewish Nation. And as to the Christian, many Ages were past before it was given; "and since it has been given, it has been far from
"prevail-

“prevailing all over the World; and consequently
 “Multitudes [numberless Millions, as was before
 said, *i. e.* all but *Jews* and *Christians*] have been
 “very hardly and unkindly dealt with.” P. 13.
 This therefore deserves to be consider’d, the Justice
 and Equity of GOD’s Providence being concern’d
 in it.

There is no Ground to imagine that any one
 Individual in the *Anti-diluvian* World was unavoid-
 ably left to the blind Guidance of Nature *only*,
 and precluded the Possibility of receiving the Ad-
 vantage of Revelation. GOD was pleas’d to make
 several Discoveries of his Will within this Period,
 particularly to *Adam*, *Abel*, *Enoch*, and *Noah*;
 which, considering the Length of Mens Lives in
 those Days, (*Methusalem* living above 240 Years
 with *Adam*, and with *Noah* 600,) there was no
 one, in all Likelihood, but might easily enough
 have receiv’d Light and Benefit from.

As to the Interval between the Flood and the
 building of *Babel*, (which * the generality of the
Hebrews, and † some of the Fathers of the Chri-
 stian Church suppose to have been about 340 Years;
 reckoning the *Dispersion* to have happen’d about the
 Time of *Peleg*’s Death,) all the Inhabitants of the
 Earth being of one Language and but one People,
 and *Noah* himself at the Head of them, (who
 liv’d till 350 Years after the Deluge,) ’tis reason-
 able to think, the Substance of all former Revela-
 tions was kept up intire during *that* Time; and all
 the *Heads* of the *Dispersion* having convers’d with
Noah for many Years, and some perhaps for above
 300, they could not but be very capable of in-
 structing their Descendants in what they had been
 instructed in themselves. The long Life of *Shem*

* *Bocharti Phaleg.* l. 2. c. 14. *Patrick* on Gen. xi. 8.

† *Hieron.* in Quæst. Heb. in Gen. *Chrysoſt.* Hom. 30. in Gen.

(who liv'd 500 Years after the Deluge : and probably his two * Brothers liv'd to about the same Age;) must have been of Service towards † keeping up the Memory of what had been reveal'd. Two Years after the Death of *Noah*, *Abraham* was born; who was the Friend of God, and had many Revelations from him. At Seventy Years of Age he was call'd from *Ur* of the *Chaldees* into the Land of *Canaan*; from thence he went into *Egypt*, and from *Egypt* return'd back to *Canaan*: And the Blessings and Protection he had in all his Travels being very remarkable, such as made him to be taken ‡ notice of, as one under the peculiar Care and Tuition of Providence, it concern'd the *Canaanites* and the *Egyptians* to acquaint themselves with the Nature of the Religion he profess'd, and his Way of Worship; which there is || Evidence enough that they did. *Isaac* and *Jacob*, beside all other Advantages, had many immediate Reve-

* *Cumberland's Origines Gentium*, p. 146.

† *Shemus* quoniam ultra quingentos post diluvium annos, decimamque adeo à seipso vidit generationem, — facillime potuit totam historiam de creatione & providentia Dei, unà cum legibus patriarchalibus, singulis his generationibus tradere, multasque potuit peragrarè terras à sua, fratrumque suorum sobole habitatas, iisque diligenter inculcare hæc omnia, tanquam ad religionem, & ad vitam civilem summe necessaria; nec ulla est ratio eür dubitemus quin hæc & voluerit facere, & reipsa præstitit. *Ibid.* p. 422.

‡ *Shuckford's Connection*, Vol. II. p. 36.

|| *Nicolaus Damascenus* says, that *Abraham's* Name was famous all over *Syria*, and that he increas'd the Fame and Reputation which he had acquir'd, by conversing with the most learned of the *Egyptian* Priests, confuting their Errors, and persuading them of the Truths of his own Religion, so that he was admir'd amongst them, as a Person of the greatest Wit and Genius, not only readily understanding a thing himself, but very happy in an Ability of convincing and persuading others of the Truth of what he attempted to teach them. *Ibid.* See also p. 38. and many other Testimonies cited by *Eusebius* to this Purpose. *Præp. Evang.* l. 9.

lations

lations from GOD, and were like bright and shining Lights to the *Canaanites*, among whom they liv'd in the Worship and Service of the true GOD without any Disturbance or Molestation. The Iniquity of the *Amorites* was not yet full. Several of them were * Followers of that which is good, and worshipp'd the Lord in Truth and in an acceptable Way. And the like may be suppos'd of other † Nations. Nay, 'tis probable enough from the Malediction, which *Noah* prophetically denounc'd against ‡ *Canaan*, that few or no Nations would be so wicked as those descended from him. But beside *Isaac*, *Abraham* had *Ismael* by *Hagar*, and six more Sons by *Keturah*: and these, as also the Children of *Lot*, his Brother's Son, growing up afterwards into several great Nations, the Knowledge of true Religion could never be lost among them but by great Carelessness, and may well be suppos'd to have been diffus'd by their means into other Countries, The Advancement of *Joseph* in *Pbaraoh's* Court, his Fame for Wisdom, and the Reputation he gain'd, together with the sojourning of the *Israelites* in *Egypt* 215 Years, could not be without its Use among that People: And when they were brought up thence with an high Hand, and with sundry kinds of Miracles, what the Design of GOD in all this was, himself declares, || *The Egyptians shall know that I am the Lord*: And he says particularly of *Pbaraoh*, § *For this Cause have I raised thee up* [† made thee stand, i. e. preserv'd thy Life from the Pestilence, reserving thee for a more remarkable Destruction] *for to shew in thee my Power, and that my Name may be declared throughout all the Earth.*

* Patrick on Gen. xv. 16. Cumberland's Origines Gent. p. 424.

† Ibid. p. 423. Shuckford's Connect. Vol. I. p. 305, &c.

‡ Gen. ix. 25.

|| Exod. vii. 5.

§ Exod. ix. 16.

† Patrick in loc.

It is far from true, what our Author asserts, that “ *the Jewish Revelation was intended to be a Guide in Matters of Religion only to the Jewish Nation.*” P. 13. The Law made particular Provision for *Strangers*, and Men of *all Countries* were encourag’d to become *Profelytes*. They were not to make War upon any distant Nation, without offering Peace to them: One of which was, that they should renounce Idolatry, and worship the one God of *Israel*: Nay, * Bishop *Patrick*, † Dr. *Jenkin*, and many other excellent Writers, with *Maimonides* at the Head of them, have been of Opinion, that even the seven Nations of the *Canaanites* might have been admitted into Friendship upon the same Terms. By ‡ *Solomon's Prayer* at the Dedication of the *Temple*, ’tis plain ’twas intended for a House of Prayer to *all Nations*. Accordingly there was a Court belonging to it, call’d the Court of the *Gentiles*, and in the New Testament we read of || Multitudes of *Profelytes* coming from all Quarters to worship at *Jerusalem*. § “ In the Time of *Joannes Hyrcanus*, all *Idumæa* embrac’d the *Jewish Religion*. *Aristobulus* having conquer’d great Part of *Ituræa*, caus’d all their Males to be circumcis’d, and to observe the Law of *Moses*, as *Strabo* testifies. Under *Alexander Jannæus*, the *Jews* took twelve Cities from the *Arabians*, and became possess’d of many Cities in *Syria*, *Idumæa*, and *Phœnicia*, all which they brought over to the Profession of their own Religion.”

* Comment. on Exod. xxiii. 32.

† Reasonableness, Vol. I. p. 69, &c.

‡ 1 Kings viii. 41, 42.

|| John xii. 20, Acts ii. 5, 10. Compare also Mark xi. 17. with Isa. lvi. 7, 8.

§ *Jenkin's Reasonableness*, Vol. I. p. 91.

Beside this, the Affairs of the *Jews* were so order'd, as might give most Nations an Opportunity of being instructed in the true Religion. Not to mention *Moses's* living in *Madian* forty Years, or *Davia's* Stay and intimate Friendship with *Achish* King of the *Philistines*: To pass by also the miraculous Victories of *Joshua*, *Sampson*, *Saul*, and others; 'tis said of *David*, that * *his Fame went out into all Lands, and the Lord brought the Fear of him upon all Nations*. The like is said of his Son † *Solomon*; and not only the Queen of *Sheba* came to see the Glory of his Kingdom, and to ‡ *prove him with hard Questions*, having heard of his Fame, concerning the Name of the Lord; but || *there came of all People to hear the Wisdom of Solomon, from all Kings of the Earth, which had heard of his Wisdom*. And this, with his Marriage with *Pharaoh's*, and other Gentile Kings Daughters, (who were all oblig'd to renounce § *Idolatry*, before he could marry them,) and his great Intimacy with *Hiram* King of *Tyre*, to whom he gave twenty Cities in † *Galilee*, and had several Cities given him by *Hiram*, ** where he plac'd *Israelites* to dwell; these Things, I say, might have good Influence towards diffusing †† the Knowledge of true Religion; especially considering that the *Tyrians* were the best skill'd of any People in Navigation; founded the ‡‡ most considerable, and the greatest Number of Colonies; traded wide and far, to ||| *Spain*,

* 1 Chron. xiv. 17. † 1 Kings x. 24. 2 Chron. ix. 26.
‡ 1 Kings x. 1. || 1 Kings iv. 34. § *Jenkin's*
Reasonableness, Vol. I. p. 80. † 1 Kings ix. 11.
** 2 Chron. viii. 2. †† *Huet. Demonstratio Evang.*
Prop. 4. cap. 12. ‡‡ *Bocharti Chanaan, l. 1. c. 2.*

||| Πρὸς αὐτὸ Κάλπη [Καρπία, uti conjicit Casaubonus] πάλιν ἐν τετρασέκοντα εὐδαίμοις ἀξιόλογον καὶ παλαιὰ, ναύσταθμόν ποτε ἡγουμένη ᾧ Ἰσὴων. Ἐνιοὶ δὲ καὶ Ἡρακλῆος κτίσμα λέγουσιν αὐτὴν, ὧν ἐστὶ καὶ Τιμοθένης, ὃς φησὶ καὶ Ἡρακλέαν ὀνομάζεσθαι τὸ παλαιόν. *strabo, l. 3. p. 140.*

and even our own * *Island of Britain*, soon † after the Reign of *Solomon*, if not ‡ sooner; and probably communicated || some Aids of Revelation, whithersoever they went. A little before the building of the Temple, the Strangers or Proselytes in the Land of *Israel* were § number'd, and they were no less than 153600. The succeeding Kings of *Israel* and *Judab* had frequent Negotiations with the Kings of *Babylon*, *Egypt*, *Syria*, and other Nations. When *Salmanasser* [721 Years before Christ] carry'd the *ten Tribes* into Captivity, he planted them in † *Hala* and in *Habor* by the River of *Gozan*, and in the Cities of the *Medes*: where they were dwelling in ** *St. Jerom's* Time, few of them ever returning to settle in their own Land. An hundred and fifteen Years after [*Anno* 606.] the two other Tribes were carry'd away

* *Plumbum ex Cassiteride Insula primus apportavit Midacritus.* *Plin.* l. 7. c. 56.

† *Newton's Chronol.* p. 32. 111, 112.

‡ *Marshall's Chron. Tables*: and with him

§ *Scripture Chron.* Mr. ¹ *Bedford* and others of our best Chronologers agree, making *Midacritus* (which, as

¶ *Canaan*, l. 1. c. 39. ² *Bochart* observes, is a Greek Name corruptly written for *Melicartus* or *Melcarthus*)

co-temporary with *Abraham* or *Isaac*. But whenever he liv'd, it is worth remarking, that in his Temple at *Gades*, which *Mela*

§ *L.* 3. kept up even to the Time of ³ *Silius* and

¶ *Apud Photium*, ⁴ *Philostatus*, that there were no Images in

Auct. 241. p. 1010. it; which, as Bishop *Cumberland* observes on a like Occasion, " is certainly a Mark of

§ *Origines Gen-* " § great Antiquity. For the corrupt Prac-

tium, p. 264. " tice of worshipping by Images grew very

" out any Image was certainly the oldest and best Manner of

" Worship "

|| *Huet.* ubi supra.

§ *2 Chron.* ii. 17.

† *2 Kings* xvii. 6.

** *Comment.* in *Joel* iii. 6. See also *Bedford's Scrip. Chron.*

P 204.

Captive

Captive to *Babylon* by *Nebuchadnezzar*, where they were * commanded to *declare* openly against the false Gods and idolatrous Worship of the Heathens. This naturally drew upon them the Malice of the Conquerors; but God by the Miracles he wrought, procur'd several publick Edicts to be made in favour of his *People* and *their Religion*. The first which *Nebuchadnezzar* [*Anno* 603.] made, runs in these Words: † *I make a Decree, that every People, Nation, and Language, which speak any thing amiss against the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, shall be cut in pieces, and their Houses shall be made a Dungbil, because there is no other God that can deliver after this sort.* About † forty Years after, he made another: ‡ *Nebuchadnezzar the King unto all People, Nations, and Languages, that dwell in all the Earth, Peace be multiplied unto you. I thought it good to shew the Signs and Wonders that the high God hath wrought towards me, &c.* And other Proclamations were issued out by || *Darius the Mede*, § *Cyrus*, ** *Darius Hystaspes*, and †† *Artaxerxes*, all tending to the same Purpose: And wherever any of these Edicts, or the Fame of them reach'd, the People were culpably negligent and inadvertent, if they did not inquire *who* the Lord *Jehovah* was; in *what Manner* the God (who could do such *Miracles* and *mighty Works*) expected to be serv'd, and *what Rules* of Practice he had prescrib'd to his People. In all likelihood Multitudes of Profelytes were made by means of these Proclamations; and when *Abasuerus* (whoever he was) publish'd his Decree in favour of the *Jews* over all his Dominions, from *India* unto *Ethiopia*, an hun-

* Jer. x. 11.

† Dan. iii. 29.

‡ *Bedford's Scripture Chron.* p. 710.

§ Dan. iv. 1, 2.

|| Dan. vi. 25.

§ 2 Chron. xxxvi. 22.

** Ezra vi. 10.

†† Extra vii. 12.

dred and twenty-seven Provinces, 'tis exprefsly faid, that * *in every Province and in every City, whithersoever the King's Commandment and his Decree came, the Jews had Joy and Gladness, a Feast and a good Day; and many of the People of the Land became Jews, i. e. were circumcis'd and became Profelytes to the Jewish Religion.* At the End of seventy Years [*Anno 536.*] by the Favour of Cyrus they had leave to return to *Judea*; but great Numbers, having got Possessions at *Babylon*, made it their Choice to continue there. *Daniel* was made Ruler over all the Province of *Babylon* by *Nebuchadnezzar*, in which Post and Dignity he liv'd to a great and uncommon Age: and *Shadrach*, *Mesbach*, and *Abed-nego* were greatly advanc'd in the same Reign. *Esther* and *Mordecai* had the highest Promotion from *Abasuerus*, and *Ezra* and *Nebemiah* were in singular Favour with *Artaxerxes*: And doubtless the *Jews*, who were zealous about making Profelytes, improv'd these Opportunities to very good Advantage. Mr. *Mede* says, † “ It “ may be not much more than half of them re- “ turn'd: Certain it is that a great Number of “ them stay'd there still; — where they flou- “ rish'd with Academies and Schools, and had “ Doctors not inferior to those of *Jerusalem* itself. “ Yea, from them proceeded the *Chaldee Para- “ phrase*, and that great Doctor and Patriarch of “ Rabbies, *R. Hillel*.”

About 520 Years before Christ the famous || *Zoroastres* appear'd, who set on foot a Reformation, which soon ‡ prevail'd all over *Media*, *Bactria*, *Persia*, and afterwards spread further among the *Parthians*, *Chowaresmians*, the *Arians*, the *Sacans*,

* *Esther* viii. 17.

† Discourse on *Acts* ii. 5.

|| *Newton's Chronology*, p. 40.

‡ *Prideaux's Connect. P. I.* p. 316. Tenth Edit.

and

and many other barbarous Nations. He taught that there is but one * GOD ; that there will be a general Resurrection and a Day of Judgment, wherein the Righteous will receive eternal Rewards, and the Wicked be punish'd everlastingly : All which the *Magian* Sect in the Eastern Countries stedfastly maintain † to this Day. *Zoroastres* was probably a ‡ *Jew* by Descent. 'Tis certain he was intimately acquainted with the sacred Writings, and went upon a || *Jewish* Platform. The Book of Religion which he set forth, is still extant, and as Dr. *Prideaux* tells us, § “ in every Oratory and
 “ Fire-Temple even to this Day there is a Copy
 “ of it kept, (in the same manner as there is with
 “ us of the Bible in every Parish-Church,) out of
 “ which at certain stated Times the Priests read a
 “ Portion of it to the People.” The same excellent Writer says further : † “ In this Book are
 “ found a great many Things taken out of the
 “ Scriptures of the Old Testament. — For therein
 “ he inserts a great part of the Psalms of *David* :
 “ He makes *Adam* and *Eve* to have been the first
 “ Parents of all Mankind, and gives in a manner
 “ the same History of the Creation and the Deluge
 “ that *Moses* doth. — He speaks therein also of
 “ *Abraham*, *Joseph*, *Moses*, and *Solomon*, in the
 “ same manner as the Scriptures do. And out of
 “ a particular Veneration for *Abraham*, he call'd
 “ his Book the Book of *Abraham*, and his Religion
 “ the Religion of *Abraham*. — For the Name of
 “ *Abraham* hath for a great many Ages past been
 “ had in great Veneration all over the East, and
 “ among all Sects. — Not only the *Jews*, the
 “ *Magians*, and the *Mahometans*, but the *Sabians*
 “ also, and the *Indians*, (if the *Brahama* of the

* Ibid. p. 304, 305. † Ibid. p. 305. ‡ Ibid. p. 300.
 || Ibid. p. 310. § Ibid. p. 317. † Ibid. p. 318.

“ latter

“ latter be *Abraham*, as it is with good Reason
 “ suppos'd,) all challenge him to themselves; as
 “ the great Patriarch and Founder of their several
 “ Sects, every one of them pretending that their
 “ Religion is the same which *Abraham* profess'd,
 “ and by his Reformation establish'd among
 “ them; and to restore this Reformation was all
 “ that *Zoroastres*, *Mabomet*, and the Author of
 “ the *Sabian* Sect pretended to.”

During the Time of the *Babylonish* Captivity
 [Anno 588.] great Numbers of the *Jews*, who were
 left in the Holy Land, flying to * *Egypt* forc'd the
 Prophet *Jeremy* along with them, and dispers'd
 themselves all over † that Kingdom. In the ‡ Year
 571 before Christ, *Nebuchadnezzar* conquer'd *Egypt*:
 when the *Jews* were forc'd to change their Habita-
 tion once more, being carry'd Captives to *Babylon*.

|| “ Nevertheless some of them remain'd still in
 “ *Egypt*, where their Families spread considera-
 “ bly.” About this Time there was great resort-
 ing to *Egypt*. The most learned Men among the
Grecians went thither in quest of Knowledge:
 where they learn'd, as § *Diodorus Siculus* tells us,
 whatever made them famous in *Greece*; and so
 many *Jews* being then in *Egypt*, 'tis very likely
 they receiv'd those Instructions from *them*, rather

* Jer. xliii. 5, 7.

† Jer. xliv. 1.

‡ See Mr. *Marshal's* Chron. Tables.

|| *Basnage's* History of the *Jews*, B. 6. c. 5. See also Isa. xi. 11.
Zach. x. 10.

§ Πολλὰ γὰρ τῶν παλαιῶν ἐδὼν τῶν ῥηγιμένων παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις
 ἔ μόνον παρὰ τῆς ἐγχωρίου ἀποδοχῆς ἐπύχον, ἀλλὰ καὶ παρὰ τῆς
 Ἑλληνικῆς μετεώσεως ἐδαυμάθη. Διότι οἱ μεγάλοι τ' ἐν παιδείᾳ
 δοξασθέντες ἐφίλουν πηρὶ πηρὶ εἰς Αἴγυπτον παρασχεῖν, ἵνα με-
 τάχῃ τῶν τε νόμων καὶ τῶν ἐπιτηδεύματων, ὡς ἀξιόλογον ὄντων.

L. 1. p. 62. Edit. *Laurentii Rhodori*.

Ἐκ τε τ' ἐκείνῃ ζήλωδεσσι παιδείας ἀποδέξαι θέρουσι, συνιστάντες
 ἔξ Αἰγύπτου μετεννοχῆναι πάντα, δι' ὧν παρὰ τοῖς Ἑλλησιν
 ἐδαυμάθησαν. Apud *Euseb.* Præp. Evang. l. 10. c. 8.

Discourse concerning REASON, &c. 63

than from the *Egyptians*. * *Justin Martyr*, † *Eusebius*, ‡ *Minucius Felix*, &c. say, they borrow'd from the Books of *Moses*: Which will be the more probable, if be it true, (" as there is || little doubt " but it is, ") what § *Clemens Alexandrinus* and † *Eusebius* tell us from *Aristobulus* the *Jew*, that the *Hebrew Scriptures*, or ** some Part of them at least, were translated into *Greek* so early as this. *Thales* was the Founder of Philosophy in *Greece*; and his Doctrine, that " Water was the Beginning of all Things, and God that Mind which " form'd all Things out of Water ; " as it †† could not possibly be discover'd by *Reason*, so 'tis palpably the very same with what *Moses* relates: ‡‡ *The Spirit of God moved upon the Face of the Waters*. *Plato* travell'd into *Egypt*, and by Conversation with the ||| *Jews*, became better acquainted with the Perfections of the Deity, the Nature of the Soul, and the Origin of the Universe, than most of the Philosophers before him had been. The learned *Vossius*, having shewn the Absurdity of the Opinion that *Plato* personally conferr'd with

* Cohortatio ad Græcos, passim.

† Præp. Evang. l. 10, 11, 12, 13.

‡ P. 16, 28. Edit. Paris.

|| *Jenkin's Reasonableness*, V. I. p. 93. See also *Mr. Whiston's Appendix to the Literal Accomplishment of the Scripture Prophecies*, p. 134, &c. 141, &c.

§ Strom. l. 1. p. 342. Edit. Paris.

† Præp. Evang. l. 9. c. 6. l. 13. c. 12.

** *Huet. Demonstratio Evang. Prop. 4. cap. 12.*

†† *Milesius* *Thales* rerum initium aquam dixit: Deum autem eam mentem, quæ ex aqua cuncta formaverit. Eho, altior & sublimior aquæ & spiritus ratio, quam ut ab homine potuerit inveniri! à Deo traditum. Vides Philosophi principalis nobiscum penitus opinionem consonare. *Min. Felix*. p. 15.

‡‡ Gen. i. 12.

||| *Stillingfleet's Origines Sacræ*, l. 3. c. 3. r*Prideaux's Connect.* Part I. p. 577. *Kidder's Demonstration*, Part III. p. 247, &c. 272, &c.

the Prophet *Jeremy*, goes on to observe: * “ He
 “ might nevertheless read the Books of *Moses*, if
 “ there was any Translation of them before that
 “ of the Seventy ; — And if there was none,
 “ yet still he might have some Conversation with
 “ the *Jews*, and with others that had been in-
 “ structed by them.” *Aristobulus* the *Jew* affirms
 directly, † “ *Plato* copied from the Law of *Moses*,
 “ and there is plain Evidence of his having search’d
 “ diligently into all the Matters contain’d in it.”
 To the same Purpose also ‡ *Josephus* speaks ; and
 long before his Time *Megasthenes*, a *Pagan* Writer,
 had witness’d in general concerning the *Greeks*,
 that || “ they borrow’d many of their Notions
 “ from a certain People of *Syria*, call’d *Jews*.”
 Nay, *Plato* himself intimates as much : § *We Greeks*,
 says he, borrow from *Barbarians*, meaning the *Jews*,
 whom he had mention’d but just before under the
 Name of *Syrians* : And he frequently speaks † of
Syrian and *Phœnician*, i. e. *Hebrew* Fables, as the

* Potuerit tamen legisse Mosen, si ante illam LXX. Seniorum
 tralationem, quædam ejus versio exstabat. — Atque ut id non
 esset, tamen colloqui datum cum Hebræis, & ab his edoctis.
 Quod verisimile facit, quæ in plerisque est Platonis cum Mose
 convenientia. *Ger. Voss. de Philos. Sectis, pars 2. c. 2. §. 3.* To
 the same Purpose *Serranus* remarks : Potuit certe *Plato*, dum esset
 in *Ægypto*, cum *Judæis* versari, quorum ibi magna erat copia ex
 transmigrationis dissipatione. *Pref. ad Platonem.*

† Φανερόν ὅτι κατηκολύθησεν ὁ Πλάτων τῇ καθ’ ἡμᾶς νομοθε-
 σία, καὶ φανερός ἐστὶ περιεργασμὸς ἔκαστα τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ. *Apud Euseb.*
Præp. Evang. l. 13. c. 12. l. 9. c. 6. Clem. Alex. Strom. 1.
p. 342.

‡ *Contra Apionem, l. 2.*

|| Ὁ Ἀπὸ τῶν μὲν τοι τὰ περὶ φύσεως εἰρημένα παρὰ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις.
 λέγεται καὶ παρὰ τοῖς ἔξω τῇ Ἑλλάδι φιλοσοφῶσι. τὰ μὲν, παρ’
 Ἰνδοῖς καὶ τῶν Βερχμάνων. τὰ δὲ, ἐν τῇ Συρίᾳ καὶ τῇ καλεμένῃ
 Ἰουδαίῳ. *Apud Clem. Alex. Strom. 1. p. 305. Euseb. Præp.*
Evang. l. 9. c. 6.

§ *In Epinom. p. 703. See also in Cratyl. p. 268.*

† *Serrani Præfat. ad Platonem. Gale’s Court of the Gentiles,*
Part II. b. 3. c. 3. Shuckford’s Preface to V. I. p. 54.

Ground

Ground of many of their Opinions. *Origen* tells us, * 'twas *Plato's* Custom to disguise his choicest Notions by putting them in a fabulous Dress, that he might not give Offence to the Populace, by appearing to borrow from the *Jews*, whose peculiar Customs and Institutes had subjected them to the Ill-will of other People. And *Serranus* says, † “ These Symbols *Plato* borrow'd from the *Jews*, “ as all the learned Fathers of the Church assert: “ but he took care never to mention the Name of “ the *Jews* :” And *Plato* himself acknowledges, that ‡ what the *Greeks* borrow'd, they beautify'd and put into a better Dress. 'Tis a noted Saying of *Numenius* the *Pythagorean*, || “ What is *Plato* but “ *Moses* in Greek ?” And we learn from *Theodoret*, that not only this *Numenius*, but § *Plutarch* also, and *Porphyry*, and many others, witness'd that *Plato*, and before him, *Pherecydes*, *Pythagoras*, *Thales*, and *Solon* receiv'd Instructions in Theology from the *Jews* dwelling in *Egypt*. Some time after, † *Aristotle* had frequent Conversation with a learned *Jew* in *Mysia*, and was instructed by him in many things, as *Josephus* tells us from a Book of *Clearchus*, one of *Aristotle's* chiefest Scho-

* Conf. l. 4. cont. *Cels.* p. 190. cum l. 7. p. 351, 352.

† Hæc vero Platonem ex Judæorum, i. e. Moſis & Prophetarum doctrina hauſiſſe, omnis erudita Chriſtianorum doctorum vetuſtas cenſuit: illum vero a Judæorum nomine de industria abſtinuiſſe. *Præf. ad Platonem.*

‡ “Ο, π περ ἀν Ἑλλῶες βαρβάρων παρὰ δῶμα, καλλίον ἔστω εἰς τέλος ἀπεργάζονται. In *Epinom.* p. 703.

|| Νεμῖν: ὁ Πυθαγόρειος φιλόσοφος ἀνέκρυσ γράφει, π γάρ ἐστι Πλάτων ἢ Μωſῆς Ἀθηναῖζων; *Clem. Alex. Strom.* l. 1. p. 342. *Suidas* in Νεμῖν:.

§ Φασὶ δὲ αὐτὰς ἐν Ἀιγύπτῳ εἶ μόνον παρὰ Ἀιγυπτίων, ἀλλὰ καὶ παρ' Ἑβραίων τὰ πρὸ τῶν ὄντως διδασκῶναι δεῖν. καὶ ταῦτα διδάσκει μὲν Πλάταρχος ὁ Βοιωτὸς, διδάσκει δὲ καὶ Πορφύριος, — καὶ μὲν τοὶ καὶ Νεμῖν: ὁ Πυθαγόρειος, καὶ ἔπειτα πλείους. *Theodoret. de Fide, Sermon. I. tom. 4. p. 466.*

† *Joseph. contra Apion.* l. 1.

lars. And hence perhaps proceeded that Similitude which there is (as * the Learned have often observ'd) in several remarkable Instances, between the Writings of *this* Philosopher, and what *Moses* and the *Prophets* teach.

In the Year 320 before Christ, *Ptolemæus Lagi* took *Jerusalem*, and carry'd away 100000 *Jews* to *Alexandria*, † where he allow'd them equal Privileges with the *Macedonians*. In 291. *Seleucus Nicanor* granted them the ‡ Freedom of *Antioch*, and of above forty other Cities which he had built in *Asia* and the lower *Syria*; where they || continued for above 300 Years in a flourishing State. And the Scriptures being translated about this Time by the Seventy into a Language generally understood, this made it the more easy for them to make Profelytes; which they § did almost *every where*, and brought over great multitudes to their Religion.

When the *Roman Empire* sprang up, we find the *Jews* were dispers'd *all over* it. *Cicero* observes, that † the Gold, which they sent to *Jerusalem*, was sent from *Italy* and *all* the other Provinces of the Empire. *Agrippa* goes farther, ** telling them

* *Aristobulus* apud *Clem. Alex. Strom.* l. 5. p. 595. *Aug. Steuch. Eug. de perenni philosophia*, l. 4. c. 8, 9, 10, 12, 20. l. 9. c. 7. *Selden de Jure Nat. Gent. Heb.* l. 1. c. 2. p. 14, 15, 23.

† *Usser. Annales*, p. 418, 419.

‡ *Usser. Annales*, p. 465.

|| *Joseph. Antiq.* l. 12. c. 3.

§ Θαυμάσιον ὃ μνηθεὶς εἰ ποσῶντο ἦν πλεῖστον ἐν ταῖς ἡμετέραις ἱερῶν, πάντων τῇ χτλ τιτὸ οἰκουμενικῷ Ἰουδαίων καὶ σεβομένων τῷ Θεῷ, ἐπὶ ὃ καὶ τῆς ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσίας καὶ τῆς Ἑυρώπης, εἰς αὐτὸν συμφερόντων ἐν πολλῶν πάντων χερῶν. *Joseph. Antiq.* l. 14. c. 12. See also de *Bello Judaico*, l. 2. c. 25. l. 7 c. 21. *Acts vi.* 9.

† Cum aurum, Judæorum nomine, quotannis ex Italia, & ex omnibus vestris provinciis Hierosolymam exportari soleret, Flaccus sanxit edicto, ne ex Asia exportari liceret. *Oratio pro L. Flacco.*

** Ὅτι γὰρ ἐστὶν ἐπὶ τῇ οἰκουμενικῇ Σῆμος, ὃ μὴ μοῖσαν ἡμετέραν ἔχων. *Joseph. de Bello Jud.* l. 2. c. 16.

Discourse concerning REASON, &c. 69

in his Oration to them, that there was not a Nation upon Earth, where some of their Brethren did not reside. *Philo* says, that * “One Country would not contain them; that they were dispers’d throughout the *whole* World, and liv’d in all flourishing Cities, not much less in Number than the Inhabitants.” *Strabo* also, as cited by † *Josephus*, witnesses, that “ ’twas no easy Matter to find out a Place of Note in the *whole* World, where the *Jews* had not got footing.” In *Rome* itself they were so numerous, that they took up a large Part of the ‡ City beyond the *Tyber*: where they liv’d in the free Exercise of their Religion, and had their || *Proseuchæ* and Synagogues for divine Worship and hearing the Law: as they had also at § *Thessalonica*, † *Athens*, ** *Corinth*, †† *Ephesus*, ‡‡ *Alexandria*, and in ||| all other Places, whither they were dispers’d. *Tacitus* tells us, that *Tiberius* sent §§ 4000 of the *Jews* out of *Rome* to *Sardinia*; and from †† *Suetonius* we learn, that this was not the whole Number, that then liv’d in the City, but the young Men only, *i. e.* exclusive of old Men, Women, and Children.

I have given this large Account of the *Jewish Dispersions*, to shew the more clearly the Groundlessness of Mr. C’s Notion, that before Christ came, all the World, except the *Jews*, were in a State of

* De Legat. ad Caium, p. 791. In Flaccum, p. 752.

† Antiq. Jud. l. 14. c. 12.

‡ Πῶς ἐν ἀπειδείῳ τὸ πέραν τῆς Τιβέριως ποταμῦ, μεγαλύτερον ἢ Ῥώμης ἀποικισθῆναι, ὡς ἐκ ἡγνότητος καὶ τεχνικῆς καὶ οἰκιστικῆς πρὸς Ἰουδαίους. *Philo* de Legat. ad Caium, p. 785.

|| Ibid. See also *Dion. Cass.* l. 60. *Claud.* 5. p. 669.

§ Acts xviii. 1. † V. 17. ** Ch. xviii. 4. †† Ch. xix. 8.

‡‡ *Philo* de Legat. ad Caium, p. 784.

||| *Philo* in Flaccum, p. 752.

§§ *Annal.* lib. 2.

†† *Lib.* 3. c. 36.

70 *Observations on Mr. CHUBB'S*

Nature, strictly so call'd, *unavoidably* destitute of the Aids of Revelation, and unequally and unfairly dealt with, as being debarr'd the Means of knowing the Duties and Motives of Religion, unless *unassisted Reason* could teach them. If all the Books of the Antients were to be ranfack'd, I don't think it could be prov'd that any Nation or People whatever *before* the coming of Christ were, *strictly* speaking, in a State of *Nature*, and much less that they were *inevitably* so, or shut out from all Access to better Light. This perhaps may be suspected of the *Americans*: But nobody can tell when *America* was first peopled, and from the comparative Paucity of the Inhabitants, when 'twas first discover'd, 'tis reasonably thought not to have been peopled till long after the other Parts of the World were. No Evidence can be brought from themselves to determine this Point; since we are told, that the * eldest Accounts and Memoirs they have, do not exceed 800 Years backwards. But what is most of all considerable, it appears from the remaining *Tradition* of the † Flood, their Belief of a Resurrection, and their using not only Sacrifices, but Circumcision also, Baptism, the Lord's Supper, something very much like the Passover, ‖ and several other *positive* Rites and Institutions, that they were far from being in a State of *Nature*. And as to the other Parts of the World, Mr. C. will find it difficult to fix his Finger upon any Spot of it, and to shew that the Religion of the Inhabitants in any one Age before Christ was *necessarily* the Religion of *Nature only*; and that they neither had, nor (which is the proper Point in Debate, so far as the

* *Stillingfleet's Origines Sacrae*, l. 3. c. 4.

† *Patrick* on Gen. vi. 17. *Bedford's Scrip. Chron.* p. 151.

‖ *Huet. Demonst. Evang. Prop.* 4. c. 7. *Jenkin's Reasonableness*, V. I. p. 105, 118, 119. Compare *Bedford's Scripture Chron.* p. 203, 204.

Justice and Equity of GOD is concern'd,) *could* have the Advantage of Revelation, tho' they had *sincerely* sought after it.

He goes on to observe, that "*Many Ages were past before the Christian Revelation was given; and since it has been given, it has been far from prevailing all over the World; and consequently Multitudes of our Species have been very hardly and unkindly dealt with.*" P. 13. That Christianity has not prevail'd *universally*, is true; but 'tis somewhat strange Mr. C. should think it any thing to the Purpose. It does not prevail in any of the *Mahometan* Countries, *Persia, Turkey, Morocco, &c.* But then our Author should have consider'd, that the *Mahometans* are as far from living in a State of Nature, as they are from being true Christians. They retain a great Part of both Testaments; and beside that, there are so many Millions of Christians interspers'd among them, that 'tis no ways unlikely they might easily enough find Means of Conversion, if they were sincere Lovers of Truth. Suppose a C—s, a T—d, and a T—l, with fifty more of the Fraternity, herding together in one of our Country-Villages; Christianity could not be said to prevail among them. But what then? Would it follow from thence, that their Reason ought to be a sufficient Guide in Religion? or that they are *unequally* and *unkindly* dealt with by GOD, if it is not? No certainly, unless GOD is oblig'd, either to make Reason stronger and more extensive than, for ought appears, he *has* made it, or else to *force* Men to believe the Gospel, whether they will or no. What Opportunities of being acquainted with the Christian Revelation the People of *Japan, China, India, &c.* have had, I shall not now say. This may be seen in the Historians, who have wrote of these Countries.

Mr. *Langlet du Fresnoy* has given a large Catalogue of them: from some of which Dr. *Jenkin* has made a few Extracts, and Mr. *Millar* a great many more, that are worth considering. I need only observe, that 'tis but too true, Men may have Access to Revelation, and know upon what Evidence it stands, and yet resist that Evidence thro' Obstinacy and Perverseness. As no Doubt can be made of this, let us suppose it to be actually the Case of the People of *Japan*. According to Mr. C's Logick they are very unfairly dealt with, if their Reason is not a sufficient Guide in Religion: And the Ground upon which he would prove it is only this; because Christianity does not prevail in *Japan*: But whether this is not to charge God foolishly, and to set down to his Account the Faults of Mankind, let any one judge.

By this time, I hope, you are pretty well convinc'd that your admir'd Author has fail'd in his Attempt. 'Tis evident enough, * "He that
 " thinks to prove that *the World ever* did in fact
 " by *Wisdom* know God, that any Nation upon
 " Earth, or any Set of Men ever did, from the
 " Principles of Reason *only*, without *any* Assistance
 " from Revelation, find out the true Nature and
 " the true Worship of the Deity," [and exhibited a fair and faultless *Pandect* of the moral Law, under the Sanctions of *eternal* Rewards and Punishments in the *next* Life,] " must find out some
 " History of the World entirely different from all
 " the Accounts which the present sacred or profane Writers do give us." And if *no* body in all History is recorded, as having in *fact* done this, I am at a Loss to guess how it can be prov'd, that *all* or *any* are sufficiently qualify'd to do it.

* *Shuckford's Connection*, Vol. I. p. 365.

And as to the other Point, that *Reason ought to be sufficient*, there is no room for this Pretence, either where Men have had the Light of Revelation to supply the Deficiency of natural Light, or where they *might* have had it, but shut their Eyes against it: one or the other of which has perhaps, in some measure at least, been the Case of the whole World. Certain it is, 'tis much easier to shew when such and such Nations had *some* Assistance from Revelation, and might have had *more*, than to shew who were *inevitably* shut out from all Access to it: Yet, Mr. C. affirming that Reason ought to be (what there is ample Ground from all History to believe it is not; and what he can bring no Evidence to prove that it is, unless the Consideration of the Divine Justice proves it,) a sufficient Guide in Religion, 'tis incumbent on him to instance in some particular Set of People, and to prove that they will be injur'd and unfairly dealt with, supposing Reason to be insufficient: And this can never be done, but by proving they are shut out, and that *inevitably* too, from the Advantage of supernatural Light: But whether Mr. C. will ever be able to make out this, 'tis easy enough to judge.

The *Hottentot* Nations are generally thought to come as near to Brutality, and to live in as much Ignorance and Stupidity as any; yet, by *Kolben's* Account, (who liv'd among them above seven Years: sent thither by a Privy-Counsellor to the late King of *Prussia*, on purpose to make Observations,) they are not left entirely to the Guidance of Nature; but have Remains of antient Revelations, however corrupted by a Mixture of Fable, and Figments of their own devising, left among them. I will transcribe a Passage or two, as Mr. *Medley* has given them in our own Language.

“ It

“ * It does not appear that the *Hottentots* have
 “ any Institution of Worship directly regarding
 “ the supreme GOD. I never saw or could hear
 “ that any one of them paid any Act of Devotion
 “ immediately to him. I have talk’d with them
 “ roundly on this Head, and endeavour’d to make
 “ them sensible of the Folly and Absurdity of
 “ neglecting his Worship, while they worship
 “ what they call Gods, that are inferior to, and
 “ dependant on him. But they will rarely reason
 “ upon the Matter, or attend to any thing that is
 “ said upon it. The most sensible of them, when
 “ they are in Humour to answer on this Head,
 “ will tell you the following very remarkable
 “ Matter. That their first Parents so grievously
 “ sinned and offended against the Supreme GOD,
 “ that he curs’d them and all their Posterity with
 “ Hardness of Heart: so that they know little
 “ of him, and have still less Inclination to serve
 “ him. The Reader, without Doubt, will be
 “ astonish’d to hear of such a Tradition as this
 “ at the *Cape of Good Hope*. I assure him, the
 “ *Hottentots* have such a Tradition, and that I
 “ have deliver’d it here without the least Addi-
 “ tion or Improvement of my own, beyond a
 “ proper Turn of Words.”

Again, † “ The *Hottentots* say, their first Pa-
 “ rents came into their Country thro’ a Window
 “ or Door-Passage, (the Word for both in the
 “ *Hottentot* Tongue being the same:) that the
 “ Name of the Man was *Nób*, and of the Woman
 “ *Hingnób*; that they were sent into their Country
 “ by GOD himself, whom they call *Tikquoa*;
 “ and that they taught their Descendants to keep

* *Kolben's Present State of the Cape of Good Hope*, p. 94.

† *Ibid.* p. 29.

“ Cattle,

“ Cattle, and to do a great many other Things.
 “ — This Tradition, which prevails and is
 “ carefully kept up in all the *Hottentot* Nations,
 “ looks extremely like a Fragment of the Story
 “ of *Noah*, who surviv’d the Flood, and who de-
 “ scended by a Window or Door from the Ark,
 “ in which he had surmounted it.” My Author
 says farther, * that they make use of *Sacrifices*,
 that they undergo at a certain Time a sort of *Cir-*
cumcision, and in several other Customs and Insti-
 tutions resemble the *Jews*: tho’ they have no
 Memory of these People, of *Moses*, or the *Law*.
 All which plainly proves that they are not in Strict-
 ness in a State of Nature.

And indeed the Custom of *sacrificing* having
 prevail’d universally over the Heathen World in
 all Ages, this alone is Ground enough to create a
 Suspicion, that no People ever were *entirely* left
 to the Guidance of natural Light; but that, as
 our first Parents had the Advantage of Revelation,
 so some *Remains* of it have been handed down
 among their Descendants in every Age from their
 Time to this. † “ For otherways it is impossi-
 “ ble, as a learned Author well argues, to give a
 “ satisfactory Account why we should meet with
 “ the same in all Ages, in all Countries, from
 “ the *East* to the *West Indies*, from *Africa* to
 “ *Scythia*, and there find Men practising the same
 “ *Piacular* Rites almost in an uniform Manner.
 “ If their Sacrifices were owing to the Gratitude
 “ or Reasoning of the different Inhabitants, they
 “ would be as widely different as their Manners
 “ and Customs are; but when we find so many
 “ different People, that have no Intercourse with

* *Ibid.* p. 30, 110.

† *Nicholl's* Conference, P. II. p. 297.

“ one another, doing exactly the same Things,
 “ as if it were by Confederacy, killing the Sacri-
 “ fice, burning the Flesh, and that too upon an
 “ Altar by the Ministry of a Priest, and with
 “ an Opinion that their Sins are discharg'd by
 “ that vicarious Punishment of the devoted Ani-
 “ mal, with many other like Circumstances; this
 “ must needs prove they could not all jump upon
 “ these Things by Chance, but had them deli-
 “ ver'd down to them by some antient Predecessor,
 “ who was Progenitor to them all.”

Nay, 'tis probable enough, this was the true
 Origin of all moral and ritual Religion, and what-
 ever we find of both (so far as they were right
 and true,) in any Age of the World. They might
 be but the Remains of antient Revelations afforded
 to *Adam*, *Abel*, and others down to *Noah*, and
 from him transmitted thro' all Ages. We are too
 apt to be partial to our own Understandings, and
 ascribe several Things to our own Invention, which
 we had the first Notices of from other People,
 and might never have known at all without such
 Assistance. To this Purpose 'tis well observ'd
 by Mr. *Lock*: * “ Nothing seems hard to our
 “ Understandings, that is once known. — For
 “ Knowledge being only of Truths that are per-
 “ ceiv'd to be so, we are favourable enough to
 “ our own Faculties, to conclude that they of
 “ their own Strength would have attain'd those
 “ Discoveries, without any foreign Assistance. —
 “ He that travels the Roads now, applauds his
 “ own Strength and Legs, that have carried him
 “ so far in such a Scantling of Time, and ascribes
 “ all to his own Vigour, little considering how
 “ much he owes to their Pains, who clear'd the

* Vol. II. p. 534.

“ Woods,

“ Woods, drain’d the Bogs, built the Bridges,
“ and made the Ways passable: without which
“ he might have toil’d much with little Progress.
“ A great many Things which we have been bred
“ up in the Belief of from our Cradles, — we take
“ for unquestionable obvious Truths, and easily
“ demonstrable; without considering how long
“ we might have been in Doubt or Ignorance of
“ them, had Revelation been silent.”

But *Reason* in the present Argument is to be consider’d *abstractedly*, in a State of Simplicity, naked and destitute of all Improvements by *supernatural* Light. I will therefore conclude with the following *Problem*. Suppose a certain Number of Infants, (fifty of each Sex,) but six Months old, were convey’d to, and left upon a remote Island, and there suckled, as ’tis fabled of the two Co-founders of *Rome*. Suppose farther, them and their Offspring for many Generations to live there, without any manner of Communication with the rest of the World, or receiving any Revelation from GOD. In this unhappy State of Nature, hard put to it to provide Cloaths and Sustenance, and destitute of a Language or Sounds fit for a clear and ready Conveyance of their Conceptions to one another; How long would it be, ere they would have any Notion at all of Religion? How many Years would elapse, before they would find out *by the Things that are made*, that there is a GOD? And how many more still, before they would have just Notions of his several Attributes; or discover what Way of Worship is most suitable to his Essence; what Actions are most perfective of their own Nature, or most becoming their Relations to one another? Lastly, How long would it be, ere they would be able to discover the *Immortality* of the Soul, and a *certain* Way
of

78 *Observations on Mr. CHUBB's, &c.*

of procuring a Reconciliation with GOD, after they have displeas'd him by their Sins? — For my part, I cannot believe, that any Set of Men in this Colony would ever be able to do *all* this. Much less can I get it into my Head, that any of the *first Founders* of it, surmounting all those Difficulties which the greatest Wits of *Greece* and *Rome* sunk under, and advancing further in moral Science than *Plato*, *Aristotle*, and *Cicero* did, would be capable of compleating so great and excellent a Work. He that thinks fit to build upon, or advance the opposite Opinion, is oblig'd to prove it.

I am, S I R,

Your most Obedient Servant,

10 FE 58

A. B.

F I N I S.



